arXiv:1701.06489v1 [math.NT] 23 Jan 2017

PLANE QUARTICS OVER $\mathbb{Q}$ WITH COMPLEX MULTIPLICATION

PINAR KILICER, HUGO LABRANDE, REYNALD LERCIER,
CHRISTOPHE RITZENTHALER, JEROEN SIJSLING, AND MARCO STRENG

Abstract. We give examples of smooth plane quartics over $\mathbb{Q}$ with complex multiplication over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ by a maximal order with primitive CM type. We describe the required algorithms as we go; these involve the reduction of period matrices, the fast computation of Dixmier–Ohno invariants, and reconstruction from these invariants. Finally, we discuss some of the reduction properties of the curves that we obtain.

Introduction

Abelian varieties with complex multiplication (CM) are a fascinating common ground between algebraic geometry and number theory, and accordingly have been studied since a long time ago. One of the highlights of their theoretical study was the proof of Kronecker's *Jugendtraum*, which describes the ray class groups of imaginary quadratic fields in terms of the division points of elliptic curves. Hilbert's twelfth problem asked for the generalization of this theorem to arbitrary number fields, and while the general version of this question is still open, Shimura and Taniyama [54] gave an extensive partial answer for CM fields by using abelian varieties whose endomorphism algebras are isomorphic to these fields. A current concrete application of the theory of CM abelian varieties is in public key cryptography, where one typically uses this theory to construct elliptic curves with a given number of points [8].

Beyond the theoretically well-understood case of elliptic curves, there are constructions of curves with CM Jacobians in both genus 2 [56, 64, 7] and 3 [31, 67, 36]. Note that in genus 2 every curve is hyperelliptic, which leads to a relatively simple moduli space; moreover, the examples in genus 3 that we know up to now are either hyperelliptic or Picard curves, which again simplifies considerations. This paper gives the first 19 conjectural examples of "generic" CM curves of genus 3, in the sense that the curves obtained are smooth plane quartics with trivial automorphism group. More precisely, it completes the list of curves of genus 3 over $\mathbb{Q}$ whose endomorphism rings over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are maximal orders of sextic fields (see Theorem 1.1). The other curves of genus 3 with such endomorphism rings are either hyperelliptic or Picard. The hyperelliptic ones were known to Weng [67], except for three curves that were computed by Balakrishnan, Ionica, Kılıçer, Lauter, Vincent, Somoza and Streng by using the methods and SageMath implementation of [4, 3].

Date: January 24, 2017.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13A50, 14H25, 14H45, 14K22, 14Q05.
Key words and phrases. complex multiplication, genus 3, plane quartics, explicit aspects.
The third and fourth author acknowledge support from the CysMoLog "défi scientifique émergent" of the Université de Rennes 1.

The Picard curves had all previously appeared in work by Koike-Weng [31] and Lario-Somoza [36].

To construct our curves, we essentially follow the classical path; first we determine the period matrices, then the corresponding invariants, then we reconstruct the curves from rational approximations of these invariants, and finally we heuristically check that the curves obtained indeed have CM by the correct order. In genus 3, however, all of these steps are somewhat more complicated than was classically the case.

The proven verification that the curves obtained indeed have CM by the correct order is left for another occasion; we restrict ourselves to a few remarks. First of all, there are no known equivalents in genus 3 of the results that bound the denominators of Igusa class polynomials [38]. In fact very little is known on the arithmetic nature of the Shioda and Dixmier–Ohno invariants that are used in genus 3, and a theoretical motivation for finding our list was to have concrete examples to aid with the generalization of the results in loc. cit.

Using the methods in [10] one could still verify the endomorphism rings of our curves directly; this has already been done for the simplest of our curves, namely

$$X_{15} : x^4-x^3y+2\,x^3z+2\,x^2y\,z+2\,x^2z^2-2\,x\,y^2z+4\,x\,y\,z^2-y^3z+3\,y^2z^2+2\,y\,z^3+z^4 = 0\,.$$

The main restriction for applying these methods to the other examples is the time required for this verification. At any rate, the results in the final section of this paper are coherent with the existence of a CM structure with the given order.

The CM fields that give rise to our curves were determined by arithmetic methods in [26, 29]. This also gives us Riemann matrices that we can use to determine periods and hence the invariants of our quartic curves. However, we do need to take care to reduce our matrices in order to get good convergence properties for their theta values. The theory and techniques involved are discussed in Section 1.

With our reduced Riemann matrices in hand, we want to calculate the corresponding theta values. We will need these values to high precision so as to later recognize the corresponding invariants. The fast algorithms needed to make this feasible were first developed in [34] for genus 2; further improvement is discussed in Section 2.1. In the subsequent Section 2.2 we indicate how these values allow us to obtain the Dixmier–Ohno invariants of our smooth plane quartic curves. This is based on formulas obtained by Weber [66, 17].

The theory of reconstructing smooth plane quartics from their invariants was developed in [46] and is a main theme of Section 3. Equally important is the performance of these algorithms, which was substantially improved during the writing of this paper; starting from a reasonable tuple of Dixmier–Ohno invariants over $\mathbb{Q}$, we now actually obtain corresponding plane quartics over $\mathbb{Q}$ with acceptable coefficients, which was not always the case before. In particular, we developed a "conic trick" which enables us to find conics with small discriminant in the course of Mestre's reconstruction algorithms for general hyperelliptic curves (by loc. cit., the reconstruction methods for non-hyperelliptic curves of genus 3 reduce to Mestre's algorithms for the hyperelliptic case). Section 3 discusses these and other speed-ups and the mathematical background from which they sprang, since without them our final results would have been too large to even write down.

We finally take a step back in Section 4 to examine the reduction properties of these curves, as well as directions for future work, before giving our explicit list of curves in Section 5.

1. Riemann matrices

Let A be a principally polarized abelian variety of dimension g over $\mathbb{C}$, such as the Jacobian $A = J(C)$ of one of the curves that we are looking for. Then by integrating over a symplectic basis of the homology and normalizing, the manifold A gives rise to a point τ in the Siegel upper half space $\mathcal{H}_g$, well-defined up to the action of the symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$. The elements of $\mathcal{H}_g$ are also known as *Riemann matrices*. In Section 1.1, we give the list, due to Kılıçer and Streng, of all fields K that can occur as endomorphism algebra of a simple abelian threefold over $\mathbb{Q}$ with complex multiplication over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. In Section 1.2, we recall Van Wamelen's methods for listing all Riemann matrices with complex multiplication by the maximal order of a given field. In Section 1.3, we show how to reduce Riemann matrices to get Riemann matrices with better convergence properties.

1.1. **The CM fields.** Let A be an abelian variety of dimension g over a field k of characteristic 0, let K be a number field of degree $2g$ and let $\mathcal{O}$ be an order in K. We say that A *has CM* by $\mathcal{O}_K$ (over $\overline{k}$) if there exists an embedding $\mathcal{O} \to \mathrm{End}(A_{\overline{k}})$.

If A is simple over $\overline{k}$ and has CM by the full ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_K$ of K, then we have in fact $\mathcal{O}_K \cong \mathrm{End}(A_{\overline{k}})$ and K is a *CM field*, i.e., a totally imaginary quadratic extension K of a totally real number field F [35].

The *field of moduli* of a principally polarized abelian variety A/k is the residue field of the corresponding point in the moduli space of principally polarized abelian varieties. It is also the intersection of the fields of definition of A in $\overline{k}$ [32, p.37]. In particular, if A is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, then its field of moduli is $\mathbb{Q}$. The field of moduli of a curve or an abelian variety is not always a field of definition [52]. However, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *There are exactly* 37 *isomorphism classes of CM fields K for which there exist principally polarized abelian threefolds $A/\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with field of moduli $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathrm{End}(A) \cong \mathcal{O}_K$. The set of such fields is exactly the list of fields given in Table 1.*

For each such field K, there is exactly one such principally polarized abelian variety A up to $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-isomorphism, and this variety is the Jacobian of a curve X of genus 3 *defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. In particular, the abelian variety A itself is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Conjectural models over $\mathbb{Q}$, correct to some precision over $\mathbb{C}$, of all curves have been computed; the cases 1 to 20 except case 4 are in Section 5 and the other cases have non-trivial automorphisms and have been computed before (see Table 1).

Proof. Everything except the models of the curves and the fact that the curves are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ is from Kılıçer [26, Thm. 4.1.1], which will be published as [29]. In the rest of this paper we work out the equations of the ones with trivial automorphism group (cases 1 to 20 except case 4) which we give in Section 5.

Therefore we need only prove the statement on the field of definition, which can be done here directly from the knowledge of CM type. By the theorem of Torelli [37, Appendix] and by Galois descent of the Jacobian, k is a field of definition for the principally polarized abelian threefold A if and only if it is a field of definition for X. In particular the field of moduli of X is $\mathbb{Q}$. In genus 3 all curves descend to their field of moduli, except for plane quartics with automorphism group $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and hyperelliptic curves with automorphism group $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ (see [42, 44]). Neither of these occurs in Table 1. Indeed, the plane quartics in it all have trivial automorphism group since the negation of the Jacobian is not induced by an automorphism of the corresponding curve. And while the table includes hyperelliptic curves with

an automorphism group of order 4, the group is always isomorphic with $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ in these cases because $\mathbb{Q}(i)$ is then a subfield of K. This concludes the proof that A is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. □

Table 1 gives a list of cyclic sextic CM fields K as follows. Let K be such a field. Then it has an imaginary quadratic subfield k and totally real cubic subfield F. In Table 1, the number d_k is the discriminant of k; the polynomial p_F is a defining polynomial for F. These two entries of the table define the field K. The number f_F is the conductor of F, and d_K is the discriminant of K. The entry # is the order of the automorphism group of the Jacobian of the corresponding curve, which is nothing but the number of roots of unity in K. The "Type" column indicates whether the conjectured model of the curve is hyperelliptic (H), Picard (P), or a plane quartic with trivial automorphism group (G). The "Curve" column gives a reference to the conjectured model over $\mathbb{Q}$ of the curve. The cases 1, 2, 3, 5, ..., 20 correspond to the smooth plane quartics X_i in Section 5.

Case	$-d_k$	p_F	f_F	$-d_K$	h_K^*	#	Type	Curve
1	7	X^3+X^2-4X+1	13	$7^3\cdot 13^4$	1	2	G	X_1 (§5)
2	7	X^3-3X-1	3^2	$3^8\cdot 7^3$	1	2	G	X_2 (§5)
3	7	$X^3+8X^2-51X+27$	$7\cdot 31$	$7^5\cdot 31^4$	1	2	G	X_3 (§5)
4	7	X^3+6X^2-9X+1	$3^2\cdot 7$	$3^8\cdot 7^5$	1	2	H	[3]+see below
5	7	$X^3+X^2-30X+27$	$7\cdot 13$	$7^5\cdot 13^4$	1	2	G	X_4 (§5)
6	7	$X^3+4X^2-39X+27$	$7\cdot 19$	$7^5\cdot 19^4$	1	2	G	X_6 (§5)
7	7	$X^3+X^2-24X-27$	73	$7^3\cdot 73^4$	4	2	G	X_7 (§5)
8	7	X^3+2X^2-5X+1	19	$7^3\cdot 19^4$	4	2	G	X_8 (§5)
9	8	X^3+X^2-4X+1	13	$2^9\cdot 13^4$	1	2	G	X_9 (§5)
10	8	X^3+X^2-2X-1	7	$2^9\cdot 7^4$	1	2	G	X_{10} (§5)
11	8	$X^3+X^2-10X-8$	31	$2^9\cdot 31^4$	4	2	G	X_{11} (§5)
12	11	X^3+X^2-2X-1	7	$7^4\cdot 11^3$	1	2	G	X_{12} (§5)
13	11	$X^3+X^2-14X+8$	43	$11^3\cdot 43^4$	4	2	G	X_{13} (§5)
14	11	X^3+2X^2-5X+1	19	$11^3\cdot 19^4$	4	2	G	X_{14} (§5)
15	19	X^3+2X^2-5X+1	19	19^5	1	2	G	X_{15} (§5)
16	19	X^3-3X-1	3^2	$3^8\cdot 19^3$	4	2	G	X_{16} (§5)
17	19	$X^3+9X^2-30X+8$	$3^2\cdot 19$	$3^8\cdot 19^5$	1	2	G	X_{17} (§5)
18	19	$X^3+7X^2-66X-216$	$13\cdot 19$	$13^4\cdot 19^5$	1	2	G	X_{18} (§5)
19	43	$X^3+X^2-14X+8$	43	43^5	1	2	G	X_{19} (§5)
20	67	$X^3+2X^2-21X-27$	67	67^5	1	2	G	X_{20} (§5)
21	4	X^3+2X^2-5X+1	19	$2^6\cdot 19^4$	1	4	H	[67, §6 3rd ex.]
22	4	X^3-3X-1	3^2	$2^6\cdot 3^8$	1	4	H	[67, §6 2nd ex.]
23	4	X^3+X^2-2X-1	7	$2^6\cdot 7^4$	1	4	H	[67, §6 1st ex.] and [61]
24	4	$X^3+X^2-10X-8$	31	$2^6\cdot 31^4$	4	4	H	[67, §6 4th ex.]
25	4	$X^3+X^2-14X+8$	43	$2^6\cdot 43^4$	4	4	H	[3]+see below
26	4	$X^3+3X^2-18X+8$	$3^2\cdot 7$	$2^6\cdot 3^8 7^4$	4	4	H	[3]+see below
27	3	X^3+X^2-4X+1	13	$3^3\cdot 13^4$	1	6	P	[31, 6.1(3)] (also [36, 4.1.3])
28	3	X^3+X^2-2X-1	7	$3^3\cdot 7^4$	1	6	P	[31, 6.1(2)] (also [36, 4.1.2])
29	3	$X^3+X^2-10X-8$	31	$3^3\cdot 31^4$	1	6	P	[31, 6.1(4)] (also [36, 4.1.4])
30	3	$X^3+X^2-14X+8$	43	$3^3\cdot 43^4$	1	6	P	[31, 6.1(5)] (also [36, 4.1.5])
31	3	$X^3+3X^2-18X+8$	$3^2\cdot 7$	$3^9\cdot 7^4$	1	6	P	[36, 4.2.1.1]
32	3	X^3+6X^2-9X+1	$3^2\cdot 7$	$3^9\cdot 7^4$	1	6	P	[36, 4.2.1.2]
33	3	$X^3+3X^2-36X-64$	$3^2\cdot 13$	$3^9\cdot 13^4$	1	6	P	[36, 4.2.1.3]
34	3	$X^3+4X^2-15X-27$	61	$3^3\cdot 61^4$	4	6	P	[36, 4.3.1]
35	3	$X^3+2X^2-21X-27$	67	$3^3\cdot 67^4$	4	6	P	[36, 4.3.3]
36	7	X^3+X^2-2X-1	7	7^5	1	14	H	$y^2=x^7-1$
37	3	X^3-3X-1	3^2	3^9	1	18	P	$y^3=x^4-x$

TABLE 1. CM fields in genus 3 whose maximal orders give rise to CM curves with field of moduli $\mathbb{Q}$, sorted by the order # of the group of roots of unity.

In the hyperelliptic cases, curves can be reconstructed by applying the SageMath [62] code of Balakrishnan, Ionica, Lauter and Vincent [3] (based on [67, 4])

and Magma [5] functionality due to Lercier and Ritzenthaler for hyperelliptic reconstruction in genus 3 [41]. Some of these curves were already computed by Weng [67]. The final cases 4, 25, 26 were found by Balakrishnan, Ionica, Kılıçer, Lauter, Somoza, Streng and Vincent and will appear online soon. The Picard curves can be obtained as a special case of our construction, but are more efficiently obtained using the methods of Koike–Weng [31] and Lario–Somoza [36]. The rational models in [67, 31, 36] as well as those that can be obtained with [4, 3, 41] are correct up to some precision over $\mathbb{C}$. In case 23, the hyperelliptic model was proved to be correct in Tautz–Top–Verberkmoes [61, Proposition 4]. The hyperelliptic model $y^2 = x^7 - 1$ for case 36 is a classical result (see Example (II) on page 76 in Shimura [53]) and the Picard model $y^3 = x^4 - x$ for case 37 is similar (e.g. Bouw–Cooley–Lauter–Lorenzo–Manes–Newton–Ozman [6, Lemma 5.1]); both can be proven by exploiting the large automorphism group of the curve.

Remark 1.2. In fact the curve in Case 4 also admits a hyperelliptic defining equation over $\mathbb{Q}$, which is not automatic; *a priori* it is a degree 2 cover of conic that we do not know to be isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$. However, in this case the algorithms in [10] show that the conjectural model obtained is correct, so that also in this case a hyperelliptic model exists over the field of moduli $\mathbb{Q}$.

In this paper, we construct models for the generic plane quartic cases.

1.2. **Obtaining Riemann matrices from CM fields.** Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a lattice of full rank $2g$ in a complex g-dimensional vector space V. The quotient $V/\mathcal{L}$ is a complex Lie group, called a *complex torus*. This complex manifold is an abelian variety if and only if it is projective, which is true if and only if there exists a *Riemann form* for $\mathcal{L}$, that is, an $\mathbb{R}$-bilinear form $E : V \times V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $E(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}) \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and such that the form

$$\begin{aligned} V \times V &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (u, v) &\longmapsto E(u, iv) \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

is symmetric and positive definite. The Riemann form is called a *principal polarization* if and only if the form E on $\mathcal{L}$ has determinant equal to 1. We call a basis $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{2g})$ of $\mathcal{L}$ *symplectic* if the matrix of E with respect to the basis is given in terms of $g \times g$ blocks as

$$\Omega_g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_g \\ -I_g & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.4}$$

For every principal polarization, there exists a symplectic basis. If we write out the elements of a symplectic basis as column vectors in terms of a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of V, then we get a $g \times 2g$ *period matrix*.

The final g elements of a symplectic basis of $\mathcal{L}$ for E form a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of V, so we use this as our basis of V. Then the period matrix takes the form $(\tau \mid I_g)$, where the $g \times g$ complex matrix τ has the following properties:

(1) τ is symmetric,
(2) $\mathrm{Im}(\tau)$ is positive definite.

We call a matrix satisfying (1) and (2) a *Riemann matrix*. The set of such matrices is called the *Siegel upper half space* and denoted by $\mathcal{H}_g$. Conversely, from every Riemann matrix τ, we get the complex abelian variety

$$\mathbb{C}^g/(\tau\mathbb{Z}^g + \mathbb{Z}^g) \tag{1.5}$$

which we can equip with a Riemann form given by Ω_g with respect to the basis given by the columns of $(\tau \mid I_g)$.

Given a CM field K, Algorithm 1 of Van Wamelen [64] (based on the theory of Shimura–Taniyama [54]) computes at least one Riemann matrix for each isomorphism class of principally polarized abelian variety with CM by the maximal order of K. For details, and an improvement which computes *exactly* one Riemann matrix for each isomorphism class, see also Streng [59]. In our implementation, we could simplify the algorithm slightly, because the group appearing in Step 2 of [64, Algorithm 1] is computed by Kılıçer [26, Lemma 4.3.4] for the fields in Table 1.

1.3. **Reduction of Riemann matrices.** Once we have Riemann matrices τ, we change them into $\mathrm{Sp}_6(\mathbb{Z})$-equivalent matrices on which the theta constants have faster convergence. For this, we want the imaginary part Y of τ, interpreted as a ternary quadratic form, to be as "nice" as possible, in the sense that its shortest vectors are large and that the standard basis vectors are reasonably Y-orthogonal and close to being the Y-shortest vectors.

In any genus g, there is an action on the Siegel upper half space $\mathcal{H}_g$ by the symplectic group

$$\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}) = \{M \in \mathrm{GL}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}) : M\,{}^t\Omega_g M = \Omega_g\} \subset \mathrm{GL}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}), \tag{1.6}$$

given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}(\tau) = (A\tau + B)(C\tau + D)^{-1}. \tag{1.7}$$

The association $\tau \mapsto (\mathbb{C}^g/\tau\mathbb{Z}^g + \mathbb{Z}^g, \Omega_g)$ gives a bijection between $\mathrm{Sp}_g(\mathbb{Z})\backslash\mathcal{H}_g$ and the set of principally polarized abelian varieties over $\mathbb{C}$ up to isomorphism.

Following Klingen [30, Section 3], we define the *Siegel fundamental domain* $\mathcal{F}_g \subset \mathcal{H}_g$ as the set of $\tau = X + iY \in \mathcal{H}_g$ that satisfy

(i) for every $M = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$, we have $|\det(C\tau + D)| \geq 1$.
(ii) Y is *Minkowski-reduced*, that is,
  (a) for all $k = 1, \ldots, g$, we have ${}^t v Y v \geq Y_{k\,k}$ for all $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_g) \in \mathbb{Z}^g$ with $\gcd(v_k, \ldots, v_g) = 1$ and
  (b) for all $k = 1, \ldots, g-1$, we have $Y_{k\,k+1} \geq 0$.
(iii) $|X_{j\,k}| \leq 1/2$ for all j and k,

Here part (i) corresponds to the determinant of Y being maximal for the $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$-orbit, because of the relation (see [30, (1.6) on page 8 and the definition on page 3] or [59, Lemma 6.9])

$$\det \mathrm{Im}(M\tau) = \frac{\det \mathrm{Im}(\tau)}{|\det(C\tau + D)|^2}. \tag{1.8}$$

In theory, one reduces a Riemann matrix to $\mathcal{F}_g$ as follows.

Algorithm 1.9 (Theoretical sketch of algorithm for reduction to $\mathcal{F}_g$.)**.**

(i) First take M such that $|\det(C\tau + D)|$ is minimal and replace τ by $M\tau$. After this step, the determinant of Y is maximal for the orbit and the resulting τ satisfies (i) by (1.8).
(ii) Next, using only transformations of the form

$$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & {}^t U^{-1} \end{smallmatrix}\right)\tau = U\,\tau\,{}^t U \text{ for some } U \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}), \tag{1.10}$$

which preserve maximality of $\det Y$, make $Y = \mathrm{Im}(\tau)$ Minkowski-reduced. Algorithms for Minkowski-reduction are well-known; see for example [1, 24, 48].

(iii) Finally, using only translations

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_g & B \\ 0 & I_g \end{pmatrix} \tau = \tau + B, \tag{1.11}$$

make sure that (iii) is satisfied without changing Y.

In practice, however, it is hard to find M such that $|\det(C\tau + D)|$ is minimal, so an iterative algorithm is used. Let S be a *finite* subset $S \subset \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$ and define condition (i)(S) by

(i)(S) for every $M = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in S$, we have $|\det(C\tau + D)| \geq 1$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_g(S) \subset \mathcal{H}_g$ be defined by (i)(S), (ii) and (iii).

Algorithm 1.12 (Reduction to $\mathcal{F}_g(S)$)**.** Repeat the following steps until one gets $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_g(S)$.

(i)(S) If condition (i)(S) is not satisfied, take a matrix $M \in S$ that violates it and replace τ by $M\tau$.

(ii) As in Algorithm 1.9.

(iii) As in Algorithm 1.9.

This algorithm terminates by [30, Lemma 3.1 on page 29].

For every g, there exists a finite set S such that $\mathcal{F}_g = \mathcal{F}_g(S)$ holds ([30, V_n above Proposition 3.3]). For such S, Algorithm 1.12 gives a reduction to $\mathcal{F}_g$.

In case $g = 1$, the set $S = \{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\}$ suffices. Moreover, in that case, step (i)(S) is simply

"if $|\tau| < 1$, then replace τ by $-1/\tau$",

and Algorithm 1.12 is the usual reduction algorithm to the fundamental domain in the upper half plane.

In case $g = 2$, a suitable set S of 19 matrices is given by Gottschling [21], and Algorithm 1.12 is written out in detail in Dupont's PhD thesis [13, Algorithme 10] and analysed further in Streng [59, Sections 6.3 and 6.4].

In case $g \geq 3$, we know no explicit finite set S satisfying $\mathcal{F}_g = \mathcal{F}_g(S)$, so we use a weaker condition instead of (i). We use (i)(S) for the one matrix set defined by $S = \{N = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} n_1 & n_2 \\ n_3 & n_4 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\}$, where

$$n_1 = \mathrm{diag}(0, 1, 1, \ldots, 1), \quad n_2 = \mathrm{diag}(1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0), \quad n_3 = -n_2, \quad n_4 = -n_1. \tag{1.13}$$

Note $\det(n_3\tau + n_4) = -\tau_{11}$, so that the condition is

(i)($\{N\}$) $|\tau_{11}| \geq 1$.

This defines a set $\mathcal{F}_g(\{N\})$ which is too large to be a fundamental domain, but for which we do have an algorithm (Algorithm 1.12). As we are already relaxing some conditions and making the set larger, we may as well relax the conditions a little bit more. In our implementation, we replace (i)($\{N\}$) by

(i') $|\tau_{1,1}| \geq 0.99$

to prevent infinite loops coming from numerical instability.

1.3.1. *LLL-reduction.* Instead of using Minkowski-reduction, one could also use LLL-reduction [39]. The main advantage being that it is fast for every genus, instead of only for small genera.

Let $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be column vectors that form a basis of a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^g$ and let $\{v_1^*, \dots, v_g^*\}$ be the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalisation. The basis $(v_1, \dots, v_g)$ is *LLL-reduced* if

(1) $|\mu_{k\,j}| \leq 1/2$ for $1 \leq j < k \leq g$, where $\mu_{k\,j} = \langle v_k, v_j^* \rangle / ||v_k^*||^2$, and
(2) $||v_k^*||^2 \geq (3/4 - |\mu_{k\,k-1}|^2)||v_{k-1}^*||^2$ for $1 < k \leq g$.

The domain $\mathcal{B}_g \subset \mathcal{H}_g$ is the set of $\tau = X + iY \in \mathcal{H}_g$ satisfying

(i') $|\tau_{11}| \geq 0.99$.
(ii') (a) Y is the Gram matrix of an LLL-reduced basis,
(b) as before: $Y_{k\,k+1} \geq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, g-1$.
(iii) as before: $|X_{j\,k}| \leq 1/2$.

Algorithm 1.14 (Reduction to $\mathcal{B}_g$)**.** Repeat until $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_g$.

(i') If condition (i') is not satisfied, then replace τ by $N\tau$.
(ii') Apply the LLL-algorithm to Y and flip the signs of some basis elements to also get (ii')(b). Then apply the corresponding transformation to τ.
(iii) As in Algorithm 1.9.

Lemma 1.15. *Algorithm 1.14 terminates, and every* $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z})$*-orbit in* $\mathcal{H}_g$ *contains only finitely many elements of* $\mathcal{B}_g$*.*

Proof. Given any $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{F}_g$ and any constant $c > 0$, by Lemma 3.1 of [30] and (1.8), there are only finitely many values for $\det \mathrm{Im}(\tau) \geq c$ for τ in the orbit of τ_0. In particular, step (i) can only be run finitely many times. This proves that the algorithm terminates.

It remains to prove the finiteness statement. We first show that for the matrix $\tau = X + iY \in \mathcal{B}_g$, there is a lower bound (depending only on g) on $\det(Y)$. Note $X_{11}^2 + Y_{11}^2 \geq 0.99$ and $|X_{11}| \leq 1/2$, hence $Y_{11} \geq \sqrt{0.99 - 0.25} > 0.86$. Using a result on LLL-reduction, Cohen [9, Theorem 2.6.2-(3)], we get

$$\det Y \geq 2^{-g(g-1)/4} Y_{11}^{g/2} > 2^{-g(g+1)/4} =: c.$$

Given an orbit $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}) \cdot \tau_0$, let $m \geq c$ be the infimum of $\det \mathrm{Im}(\tau)$ for $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_g$ in the orbit. Note that this infimum is attained because (as noted in the first paragraph of this proof) there are only finitely many values of $\det \mathrm{Im}(\tau) \geq m$ for τ in the orbit. So let $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{B}_g$ be such that it attains this infimum.

We now show that there are only finitely many

$$\tau = X + Yi = M\tau = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \tau_0 \in \mathcal{B}_g.$$

By (1.8) and the choice of τ_0, we get

$$|\det(C\tau + D)| < 1. \tag{1.16}$$

By Lemma 3.1 of [30], this implies that (C, D) is among a finite set (depending only on g) of candidates up to left-multiplication by $U \in \mathrm{GL}_g(\mathbb{Z})$. In other words, it implies that we can write

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & S \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & {}^tU^{-1} \end{pmatrix} M_0 \tag{1.17}$$

with S symmetric, U invertible, and M_0 in a finite set of matrices (depending only on g). Let $\tau_1 = M_0\tau_0$ and $Y = \mathrm{Im}\tau_1$.

Note that there are only finitely many LLL-reduced bases for any lattice. Indeed, the product of the lengths of the vectors in an LLL-reduced basis satisfies the upper bound [9, 2.6.2(1)], while the individual basis vectors are lower-bounded by the length of the shortest vector, hence all vectors in an LLL-reduced basis are bounded in terms of the lattice. A more precise analysis[1] even leads to a uniform bound $2^{O(g^3)}$ which depends only on the dimension g of the lattice. In particular, there are finitely many choices for an LLL-reduced basis. It follows that there are only finitely many many U such that UY^tU is an LLL-reduced Gram matrix. And then for each U, there are at most $2^{g(g+1)/2}$ matrices S for which the real parts X_{ij} are in the interval $[-1/2, 1/2]$. □

1.4. **Conclusion and efficiency.** Without reduction, we were unable to compute Dixmier-Ohno invariants (as in Section 2) to sufficient precision. It takes only a minute to compute the reduction to $\mathcal{B}_3$ (with Algorithm 1.14) or $\mathcal{F}_g(\{N\})$ (with Algorithm 1.12) for all our Riemann matrices. Then computing the Dixmier–Ohno invariants with the fast algorithm of Section 2 below takes about the same amount of time for $\mathcal{B}_3$ as for $\mathcal{F}_3(\{N\})$. We conclude that for $g = 3$, there is no reason to prefer one of these algorithms over the other, but it is very important to use at least one of them. We do advise caution with the LLL-reduced version, as the analysis in Section 2 below is valid only for Minkowski-reduced matrices. Still, we managed to compute all our curves using the LLL-reduced version.

2. Computing the Dixmier–Ohno invariants

In this section, we show how given a Riemann matrix τ we can obtain an approximation of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants of a corresponding plane quartic curve. One procedure has been described in [23] and relies on the computation of derivatives of odd theta functions. Here we take advantage of the existence of fast strategies to compute the Thetanullwerte to emulate the usual strategy for such computations in the hyperelliptic case [67, 4]: we use an analogue of the Rosenhain formula to compute a special *Riemann model* for the curve from the Thetanullwerte, from which we then calculate an approximation of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants. By normalizing these, we find an explicit representative of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants as an element of a weighted projective space over $\mathbb{Q}$.

2.1. Fast computation of the Thetanullwerte from a Riemann matrix.

Definition 2.1. The *Thetanullwerte* or *theta-constants* of a Riemann matrix τ in $\mathcal{H}_g$ (that is, a $g \times g$ complex matrix with positive definite imaginary part) are defined as

$$\vartheta_{[a;b]}(0,\tau) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^g} e^{i\pi\left({}^t(n+a)\tau(n+a)+2^t(n+a)b\right)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $a, b \in \{0, 1/2\}^g$. We define the *fundamental Thetanullwerte* to be those $\vartheta_{[a;b]}$ with $a = 0$; there are 8 of them. We simplify notation by writing

$$\vartheta_{[a;b]} = \vartheta_i, \qquad i = 2(b_0+2b_1+\cdots+2^{g-1}b_{g-1})+2^{g+1}(a_0+2a_1+\cdots+2^{g-1}a_{g-1}) \tag{2.3}$$

[1] see http://mathoverflow.net/questions/57021/how-many-lll-reduced-bases-are-there.

In other words, we number the Thetanullwerte by interpreting the reverse of the sequence $(2b||2a)$ as a binary expansion. This is the numbering used in, e.g., [13, 34]. For notational convenience, we write $\vartheta_{n_1,\dots,n_k}$ for the k-tuple $\vartheta_{n_1},\dots,\vartheta_{n_k}$. In this section, we describe a fast algorithm to compute the Thetanullwerte with high precision. Note that it is sufficient to describe an algorithm that computes the fundamental Thetanullwerte; we can then compute the squares of all 64 Thetanullwerte by computing the fundamental ones at $\tau/2$, then use the following τ-duplication formula [25, Chap. IV]:

$$\vartheta_{[a;b]}(0,\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{2^g}\sum_{\beta\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^g/\mathbb{Z}^g} e^{-4i\pi^t a\beta}\vartheta_{[0;b+\beta]}\left(0,\frac{\tau}{2}\right)\vartheta_{[0;\beta]}\left(0,\frac{\tau}{2}\right). \tag{2.4}$$

We can then recover the 64 Thetanullwerte from their square, by using a low-precision approximation of their value to decide on the appropriate square root. Both algorithms described in this subsection have been implemented in Magma [33].

2.1.1. *Naive algorithm for the Thetanullwerte.* A (somewhat) naive algorithm to compute the Thetanullwerte consists in computing the sum in Definition 2.1 until the remainder is too small to make a difference at the required precision. We show in this section that it is possible to compute the genus 3 Thetanullwerte up to 10^{-P} using $O(\mathcal{M}(P)P^{1.5})$ bit operations, where $\mathcal{M}(P)$ is the number of bit operations needed for one multiplication of P-bit integers; the strategy is to determine a suitable summation domain, and use induction relations to compute the terms. The running time is the same as the general strategy given in [11], as analyzed in [34, Section 5.3].

We do an analysis similar to the ones in [13, 34]. We can use the Minkowski reduction of Section 1.3 and hence assume without loss of generality that $\mathrm{Im}(\tau)$ is Minkowski-reduced.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $Y=(Y_{ij})_{ij}$ be a Minkowski-reduced 3×3 positive definite symmetric real matrix. Let $d=1/100$. Then, for all $n\in\mathbb{R}^3$ we have ${}^tnYn \geq dY_{11}\,{}^tn\,n$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Let n be a counterexample. Let $I\in\{1,2,3\}$ be such that $n_I^2=\max_i n_i^2$. Let $\{I,J,K\}=\{1,2,3\}$. Without loss of generality, we have $Y_{II}=1$ (scale Y) and $n_I=1$ (scale n). Minkowski-reducedness gives $Y_{ii}\geq Y_{11}$ for all i and $2Y_{ii}\geq|Y_{ij}|$ for all $i\neq j$.

Let $s_{ij}=1$ if $Y_{ij}\geq 0$ and $s_{ij}=-1$ if $Y_{ij}<0$. In particular, we have $s_{ji}=s_{ij}$ and by Minkowski-reducedness also $s_{12}=s_{23}=1$.

Note that we now have

$$3d \geq dY_{11}\,{}^tnn > {}^tnYn = \sum_i n_i^2(Y_{ii}-\sum_{j\neq i}|Y_{ij}|) + \sum_{\substack{\{i,j\}\\ \text{s.t. } i\neq j}}(n_i+s_{ij}n_j)^2|Y_{ij}|. \tag{2.6}$$

Note that all terms on the right hand side are non-negative as Minkowski-reduction implies $Y_{ii}\geq 2\cdot\frac{1}{2}Y_{ii}\geq\sum_{j\neq i}|Y_{ij}|$. As all terms on the right hand side are non-negative, we find that all terms are less than $3d$.

Let $\alpha=3/4$.

We distinguish between two cases.

Case I: there exists a j with $-s_{Ij}n_j<\alpha$.

Case II: for all j, we have $-s_{Ij}n_j\geq\alpha$.

Proof in case I.

We get $3d\geq(1+s_{Ij}n_j)^2|Y_{Ij}|\geq|Y_{Ij}|(1-\alpha)^2$, hence $|Y_{Ij}|\leq 3d/(1-\alpha)^2$.

Therefore, we get $3d \geq (Y_{II} - |Y_{IJ}| - |Y_{IK}|) \geq 1 - 6d/(1-\alpha)^2 = 1 - 96d$. Contradiction as $d < 1/99$.

Case II has subcases + and − according to the sign of Y_{13}.

Proof in case II+.

In this subcase, we have $s_{ij} = 1$ for all i and j. In particular, we have that $n_J, n_K \leq -\alpha$ both negative. Therefore, we have $(n_J + n_K)^2 \geq 4\alpha^2$. By (2.6), we therefore get

$$3d \geq 4\alpha^2 |Y_{JK}|. \tag{2.7}$$

On the other hand, we also get

$$3d \geq (Y_{JJ} - |Y_{IJ}| - |Y_{JK}|) n_J^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} Y_{JJ} - \frac{3}{4} d/\alpha^2\right) \alpha^2 = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 Y_{JJ} - \frac{3}{4} d. \tag{2.8}$$

In other words, we get $Y_{JJ} \leq 9d/(2\alpha^2)$ and by symmetry also $Y_{KK} \leq 9d/(2\alpha^2)$. Using (2.6) again, we get

$$3d \geq (Y_{II} - |Y_{IJ}| - |Y_{JK}|) \geq Y_{II} - \frac{1}{2} Y_{JJ} - \frac{1}{2} Y_{KK} \geq 1 - \frac{9d}{2\alpha^2} = 1 - 8d. \tag{2.9}$$

Contradiction as $d < 1/11$.

Proof in case II−.

Put $(\varepsilon_{ij})_{ij} = Y - X$ with

$$X = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.10}$$

We have $|n_i| \geq -s_{Ii} n_i \geq \alpha$ for all i, hence (2.6) gives $(Y_{ii} - |Y_{ij}| - |Y_{ik}|) \leq 3d/\alpha^2$ for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. As we also have $|Y_{ij}| \leq Y_{ii}/2$, we get $Y_{ii}/2 - |Y_{ik}| \leq 3d/\alpha^2$. In particular, we get $\varepsilon_{Ik} \leq 3d/\alpha^2$ for all $k \neq I$. We then get $\varepsilon_{kk} \leq 6d/\alpha^2$ and hence $\varepsilon_{JK} \leq 9d/\alpha^2$.

As Y is Minkowski-reduced, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = Y_{II} &\leq (1,-1,1) Y^t (1,-1,1) \\ &= (1,-1,1) X^t (1,-1,1) + (1,-1,1) (\varepsilon_{ij})_{ij}{}^t (1,-1,1) \\ &\leq 0 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} |\varepsilon_{ij}| \leq 54 d/\alpha^2 = 96d. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Contradiction as $d < 1/96$. □

Write $\tau = (\tau_{ij})_{ij}$, $Y_{ij} = \mathrm{Im}(\tau_{ij})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \min(Y_{11} - Y_{12} - |Y_{13}|,\ Y_{22} - Y_{21} - Y_{23},\ Y_{33} - Y_{32} - |Y_{31}|) \\ c &= \max(c_1, d Y_{11}) \qquad \text{with } d = 1/100. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.12. *If* $\mathrm{Im}(\tau)$ *is Minkowski reduced, then we have*

$$\mathrm{Im}\left({}^t(m,n,p)\tau(m,n,p)\right) \geq c(m^2 + n^2 + p^2)\,.$$

Proof. In case $c = dY_{11}$, use Lemma 2.5. Otherwise, we have $c = c_1$. Now, for $(m,n,p) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, using the inequalities $2|mn| \leq (m^2+n^2)$ and $i_{12}, i_{23} > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Im}\left({}^t(m,n,p)\tau(m,n,p)\right) \geq \\ (Y_{11} - Y_{12} - |Y_{13}|)m^2 + (Y_{22} - Y_{21} - Y_{23})n^2 + (Y_{33} - Y_{32} - |Y_{31}|)p^2 \geq \\ c_1(m^2+n^2+p^2) \quad (2.13)\end{aligned}$$

□

Now, if S_B denotes the partial summation of ϑ_0 with indices in $[-B,B]^3$, we get

Lemma 2.14. *For $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_3(\{N\})$, we have $c \geq \sqrt{3}/200$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $c \geq Y_{11}/100$. By (i)($\{N\}$) and (iii) of Section 1.3, we have $Y_{11}^2 + X_{11}^2 \geq 1$ with $X_{11} = \operatorname{Re}(\tau_{11}) \in [-1/2, 1/2]$, hence $Y_{11}^2 \geq 3/4$. □

$$\begin{aligned}|\vartheta_0(0,\tau) - S_B| &\leq 8 \sum_{\substack{m \text{ or } n \text{ or } p \geq B \\ \text{and } m,n,p \geq 0}} e^{-\pi c(m^2+n^2+p^2)} \\ &\leq 24 \sum_{m \geq B, n \geq 0, p \geq 0} e^{-\pi c(m^2+n^2+p^2)} \\ &\leq 24 \frac{e^{-\pi c B^2}}{(1-e^{-\pi c})^3} \leq 24 \left(\pi c e^{-\pi c}\right)^3 \times e^{-\pi c B^2}\end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

For $\tau \in \mathcal{F}_3(\{N\})$ we have an absolute lower bound on c, hence taking $B = O\left(\sqrt{P}\right)$ is enough to ensure that S_B is within 2^{-P} of ϑ_0.

The computation of S_B is then done as follows. Let $q_{jk} = e^{i\pi\tau_{jk}}$ and

$$t_{m,n,p} = e^{i\pi(m,n,p)\tau^t(m,n,p)}.$$

Then we have the following recursion relations:

$$\begin{aligned}t_{m+1,n,p} &= t_{m,n,p} q_{11}^{2m} q_{11} q_{12}^{2n} q_{13}^{2p} \\ t_{m,n+1,p} &= t_{m,n,p} q_{22}^{2n} q_{22} q_{12}^{2m} q_{23}^{2p} \\ t_{m,n,p+1} &= t_{m,n,p} q_{33}^{2p} q_{33} q_{23}^{2n} q_{13}^{2m}\end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Hence, the computation of S_B reduces to the computation of the q_i and the use of the recursion relations to compute each term. This allows the computation of the genus 3 Thetanullwerte in $O(\mathcal{M}(P)P^{1.5})$; we refer to our implementation [33] of the naive algorithm for full details.

2.1.2. *Fast algorithm for the Thetanullwerte.* In this section, we generalize the strategy described in genus 1 and 2 in [13] and ideas taken from [34, Chapter 7]. This leads to an evaluation algorithm with running time $O(\mathcal{M}(P)\log P)$.

We start, as in [13], by writing the τ-duplication formulas in terms of ϑ_i^2; for instance,

$$\vartheta_1(0,2\tau)^2 = \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_0^2}\sqrt{\vartheta_1^2} + \sqrt{\vartheta_2^2}\sqrt{\vartheta_3^2} + \sqrt{\vartheta_4^2}\sqrt{\vartheta_5^2} + \sqrt{\vartheta_6^2}\sqrt{\vartheta_7^2}}{4}(0,\tau). \quad (2.17)$$

These formulas match with the iteration used in the definition of the genus 3 *Borchardt mean* $\mathcal{B}_3$ [13]; this can be seen as a generalization to higher genus of the

arithmetic-geometric mean, since both have links to the Thetanullwerte and both converge quadratically [13].

Applying the τ-duplication formula to the fundamental Thetanullwerte repeatedly gives

$$\mathcal{B}_3\left(\vartheta_{0,1,\dots,7}(0,\tau)^2\right) = 1 \tag{2.18}$$

assuming one picks correct square roots $\vartheta_i(0,2^k\tau)$ of $\vartheta_i(0,2^k\tau)^2$. By the homogeneity of the Borchardt mean, we can write

$$\mathcal{B}_3\left(1, \frac{\vartheta_{1,\dots,7}(0,\tau)^2}{\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2}. \tag{2.19}$$

We wish to use this equality to compute the right-hand side from the quotients of Thetanullwerte; this is a key ingredient to our quasi-linear time algorithm. The difficulty here stems from the fact that the Borchardt mean requires a technical condition on the square roots picked at each step ("good choice") in order to get a quasi-linear running time, and sometimes these choices of square roots do not correspond to the values of ϑ_i we are interested in (i.e. would not give $1/\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2$ at the end of the procedure). We sidestep this difficulty using the same strategy as [34]: we design our algorithm so that the square roots we pick always correspond to the values of ϑ_i we are interested in, even when they do not correspond to "good choices" of the Borchardt mean. This slows down the convergence somewhat; however, one can prove (using the same method as in [34, Lemma 7.2.2]) that after a number of steps that only depends on τ (and not on P), our choice of square roots always coincides with "good choices". After this point, only $\log P$ steps are needed to compute the value with absolute precision P, since the Borchardt mean converges quadratically; this means that the right-hand side of Equation (2.19) can be evaluated with absolute precision P in $O(\mathcal{M}(P)\log P)$.

The next goal is to find a function $\mathfrak{F}$ to which we could apply Newton's method to compute these quotients of Thetanullwerte (and, ultimately, the Thetanullwerte). For this, we use the action of the symplectic group to get relationships involving the coefficients of τ. Using the action of the matrices described in [13, Chapitre 9], along with the Borchardt mean, we can build a function f with the property that

$$f\left(\frac{\vartheta_{1,\dots,7}(0,\tau)^2}{\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2}\right) = (-i\tau_{11}, -i\tau_{22}, -i\tau_{33}, \tau_{12}^2 - \tau_{11}\tau_{22}, \tau_{13}^2 - \tau_{11}\tau_{33}, \tau_{23}^2 - \tau_{22}\tau_{33}) \tag{2.20}$$

However, the above function is a function from $\mathbb{C}^7$ to $\mathbb{C}^6$; this is a problem, as it prevents us from applying Newton's method directly. As discussed in [34, Chapter 7], there are two ways to fix this: either work on the variety of dimension 6 defined by the fundamental Thetanullwerte, or add another quantity to the output and hope that the Jacobian of the system is then invertible. We choose the latter solution, which works in practice; the added output is derived from the symplectic action of the matrix $\mathfrak{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_g \\ I_g & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ on the Thetanullwerte:

$$\vartheta_{0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7}^2(0, \mathfrak{J}\cdot\tau) = -i\det(\tau)\vartheta_{0,8,16,24,32,40,48,56}^2(0,\tau) \tag{2.21}$$

We thus explicitly define $\mathfrak{F}$ in Algorithm 2.22.

Algorithm 2.22 (Given a 7-tuple $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_7 \in \mathbb{C}$, computes a number $\mathfrak{F}(a_1,\dots,a_7)$, defined by the steps in this algorithm. Here we are specifically interested in the

value $\mathfrak{F}(\,\vartheta_{1,\dots,7}(0,\tau)^2/\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2\,)$, so for clarity we abuse the notation and denote a_i by $\vartheta_i(0,\tau)^2/\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2$.).

(i) Compute $t_0 = \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta_{1,\dots,7}(0,\tau)^2/\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2\,)$.
(ii) Compute $t_i = (1/t_0) \times \vartheta_i(0,\tau)^2/\vartheta_0(0,\tau)^2$.
(iii) $t_i \leftarrow \sqrt{t_i}$, choosing the square root that coincides with the value of $\vartheta_i(0,\tau)$ (computed with low precision just to inform the choice of signs).
(iv) Apply the τ-duplication formulas to the t_i to compute complex numbers that by abuse of notation we write as $\vartheta_i(0,2\tau)^2$. (Here if $t_i = \vartheta_i(0,\tau)$, then "$\vartheta_i(0,2\tau)^2$" is really equal to $\vartheta_i(0,2\tau)^2$.)
(v) $r_1 \leftarrow \vartheta_{32}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{32,33,34,35,0,1,2,3}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(vi) $r_2 \leftarrow \vartheta_{16}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{16,17,0,1,20,21,4,5}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(vii) $r_3 \leftarrow \vartheta_{8}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{8,0,10,2,12,4,14,6}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(viii) $r_4 \leftarrow \vartheta_{0}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{0,1,32,33,16,17,48,49}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(ix) $r_5 \leftarrow \vartheta_{0}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{0,32,2,34,8,40,10,42}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(x) $r_6 \leftarrow \vartheta_{0}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{0,16,8,24,4,20,12,28}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(xi) $r_7 \leftarrow \vartheta_{0}^2(0,2\tau) \times \mathcal{B}_3(\,1, \vartheta^2_{0,8,16,24,32,40,48,56}(0,2\tau)/\vartheta_0^2(0,2\tau)\,)$.
(xii) Return $(\,r_1/2,\, r_2/2,\, r_3/2,\, r_4/4,\, r_5/4,\, r_6/4,\, r_7/8\,)$.

The final algorithm then consists in applying Newton's method to $\mathfrak{F}$, starting with an approximation of the quotients of Thetanullwerte with precision P_0 so that the method converges. Since computing $\mathfrak{F}$ is asymptotically as costly as computing the Borchardt mean, and since there is no extra asymptotic cost when applying Newton's method if one doubles the working precision at each step, we get an algorithm which computes the genus 3 Thetanullwerte with P digits of precision with time $O(\mathcal{M}(P)\log P)$. This algorithm was implemented in Magma (with $P_0 = 450$), along with the aforementioned naive algorithm. On our examples, the fast algorithm give the result with more than 2000 digits of precision in less than 10 seconds for all cases except 3. In this case we used the naive version, that returned the result with 450 digits of precision in a bit more than 20 second.

Example 2.23. We will start the study of case 15. Here is the list of fundamental Thetanullwerte we get (with 5 decimal digits of precision)

$$(1.7789 - 0.055646i,\ 1.5843 + 0.23306i,\ 0.99297 - 0.60412i,\ 1.0036 - 0.27854i,\\ 1.2081 + 0.31631i,\ 0.78848 + 0.21153i,\ 0.32810 + 0.028558i,\ 0.30191 + 0.14885i) \quad (2.24)$$

and then the list of Thetanullwerte

$$(1.0771 - 0.00068977i,\ 1.0771 + 0.00068977i,\ 1.0057 - 0.12650i,\ \dots,\\ 0.052643 + 0.32013i,\ 1.1892 \cdot 10^{-1001} - 1.1892 \cdot 10^{-1001} i)\,. \quad (2.25)$$

2.2. **Computation of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants.** Consider Thetanullwerte $(\vartheta_0(\tau), \dots, \vartheta_{63}(\tau)) \in \mathbb{C}^{64}$ as computed in the previous section. Then by Riemann's vanishing theorem [49, V.th.5] and Clifford's theorem [2, Chap.3,§1] these values correspond to a smooth plane quartic curve if and only if they are all nonzero. If this condition is satisfied, the following procedure determines the equation of a plane quartic $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ for which there is a Riemann matrix τ that gives these Thetanullwerte.

Using [66, p.108] (see also [17]), we compute the *Weber moduli*

$$\begin{aligned} a_{11} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_{33}\vartheta_5}{\vartheta_{40}\vartheta_{12}}, & a_{12} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_{21}\vartheta_{49}}{\vartheta_{28}\vartheta_{56}}, & a_{13} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_7\vartheta_{35}}{\vartheta_{14}\vartheta_{42}}, \\ a_{21} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_5\vartheta_{54}}{\vartheta_{27}\vartheta_{40}}, & a_{22} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_{49}\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_{47}\vartheta_{28}}, & a_{23} &:= i\frac{\vartheta_{35}\vartheta_{16}}{\vartheta_{61}\vartheta_{14}}, \\ a_{31} &:= -\frac{\vartheta_{54}\vartheta_{33}}{\vartheta_{12}\vartheta_{27}}, & a_{32} &:= \frac{\vartheta_2\vartheta_{21}}{\vartheta_{56}\vartheta_{47}}, & a_{33} &:= \frac{\vartheta_{16}\vartheta_7}{\vartheta_{42}\vartheta_{61}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Note that these numbers depend only on half of the Thetanullwerte. The three projective lines $\ell_i : a_{1i}x_1 + a_{2i}x_2 + a_{3i}x_3 = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$, together with the four lines

$$x_1 = 0,\ x_2 = 0,\ x_3 = 0,\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0 \tag{2.27}$$

will form a so-called *Aronhold system* of bitangents to the eventual quartic $X_{\mathbb{C}}$. Considering the first three lines as a triple of points $((a_{1i} : a_{2i} : a_{3i}))_{i=1\ldots3}$ in $(\mathbb{P}^2)^3$, one obtains a point on a 6-dimensional quasiprojective variety. Its points parametrize the moduli space of smooth plane quartics with full level two structure [22].

From an Aronhold system of bitangents, one can reconstruct a plane quartic following Weber's work [66, p.93] (see also [50, 17]). We take advantage here of the particular representative (a_{1i}, a_{2i}, a_{3i}) of the projective points $(a_{1i} : a_{2i} : a_{3i})$ to simplify the algorithm presented in loc. cit. Indeed, normally that algorithm involves certain normalization constants k_i. However, in the current situation [17, Cor.2] shows that these constants are automatically equal to 1 for our choices of a_{ji} in (2.26), which leads to a computational speedup. Let $u_1,\ u_2,\ u_3 \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ be given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ u_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{a_{11}} & \frac{1}{a_{12}} & \frac{1}{a_{13}} \\ \frac{1}{a_{21}} & \frac{1}{a_{22}} & \frac{1}{a_{23}} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.28}$$

Then $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the curve defined by the equation $(x_1u_1+x_2u_2-x_3u_3)^2-4x_1u_1x_2u_2 = 0$.

We now have a complex model $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ of the quartic curve that we are looking for. Note that there is no reason to expect $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ to be defined over $\mathbb{Q}$; its coefficients will in general be complicated algebraic numbers that are difficult to recognize algebraically. We can approximate its 13 *Dixmier–Ohno invariants*, which were defined in [12, 16, 19] (see [46, Sec.1.2] for a short description). These invariants

$$\underline{I} = (I_3 : I_6 : I_9 : J_9 : I_{12} : J_{12} : I_{15} : J_{15} : I_{18} : J_{18} : I_{21} : J_{21} : I_{27}) \tag{2.29}$$

are homogeneous expressions in the coefficients of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ of degree

$$\underline{d} = (3, 6, 9, 9, 12, 12, 15, 15, 18, 18, 21, 21, 27). \tag{2.30}$$

Therefore the invariants of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ give rise to a point in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}^{\underline{d}}$. Note that I_{27} is the discriminant of $X_{\mathbb{C}}$, which is non-zero.

In order to finish our task, we need to find a rational representative of our projective tuple of Dixmier–Ohno invariants. The particular representative in $\mathbb{C}^{13}$ that we obtained above is typically not rational; instead, we need to normalize these invariants. When $I_3 \neq 0$ (as will always be the case for us), we can for instance use

the normalization

$$\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{norm}} = \left(1, \frac{I_6}{I_3^2}, \frac{I_9}{I_3^3}, \frac{J_6}{I_3^3}, \frac{I_{12}}{I_3^4}, \frac{J_{12}}{I_3^4}, \frac{I_{15}}{I_3^5}, \frac{J_{15}}{I_3^5}, \frac{I_{18}}{I_3^6}, \frac{J_{18}}{I_3^6}, \frac{J_{21}}{I_3^7}, \frac{J_{21}}{I_3^7}, \frac{I_{27}}{I_3^9}\right). \tag{2.31}$$

Our program concludes by computing the best rational approximation of (the real part) of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants $\underline{\mathrm{I}}$ by using the corresponding (PARI) function `BestApproximation` in MAGMA at increasing precision until the sequence stabilizes. In practice, this happens quite quickly: we worked with less than 1000 decimal digits and the denominators do not exceed 100 decimal digits.

For some of the CM fields, there exist four principally polarized abelian varieties, and we know by Theorem 1.1 that exactly one of them has field of moduli $\mathbb{Q}$. We do not in advance which of the four it is. For such fields, we use `BestApproximation` for each of the four cases and we observe that this succeeds (at less than 1000 decimal digits) for exactly one of them. We then continue with only the Dixmier-Ohno invariants of that case.

Some manipulations, illustrated in the example below, then give us an integral representative $\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{min}}$ of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants for which the gcd of the entries is minimal.

Example 2.32. We resume with case 15. From the Thetanullwerte that we computed, we get the following Weber moduli (up to 5 decimal digits)

$$\begin{aligned}(&-2.8253 + 2.0154i, -2.6410 + 1.6259i, -2.9969 + 1.9566i, 3.9384 + 0.45576i,\\ &3.9384 - 0.45576i, 4.1412, 2.7372 + 1.8762i, 4.5067 - 7.2222i, 2.8205 - 3.2107i)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

The Dixmier–Ohno invariants are given by

$$\begin{aligned}(&-4.1230 \cdot 10^8 + 1.7877 \cdot 10^9 i, -1.9698 \cdot 10^{16} - 9.5963 \cdot 10^{15} i, 5.9285 \cdot 10^{27} - 7.3314 \cdot 10^{27} i,\\ &3.6116 \cdot 10^{27} - 4.4661 \cdot 10^{27} i, 1.7185 \cdot 10^{36} + 2.1954 \cdot 10^{36} i, 1.1038 \cdot 10^{37} + 1.4102 \cdot 10^{37} i,\\ &-9.9560 \cdot 10^{45} + 4.6564 \cdot 10^{45} i, -2.2796 \cdot 10^{45} + 1.0661 \cdot 10^{45} i, -6.1732 \cdot 10^{54} - 2.8848 \cdot 10^{55} i,\\ &-2.3008 \cdot 10^{54} - 1.0752 \cdot 10^{55} i, 1.9358 \cdot 10^{64} + 3.0698 \cdot 10^{62} i, 3.0970 \cdot 10^{65} + 4.9112 \cdot 10^{63} i,\\ &-3.6732 \cdot 10^{76} - 1.8621 \cdot 10^{76} i)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Computing the best approximation of the normalized invariants $\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{norm}}$ we get

$$\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{norm}} = \left(1 : \frac{3967}{609408} : \cdots : \frac{3463042262266603 71}{19803882946782577955962 88}\right). \tag{2.35}$$

We first get an integral representative by taking λ to be the least common multiple of the denominators of $\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{norm}}$ and setting

$$\underline{\mathrm{I}}' = (\lambda, \lambda^2 I_6, \lambda^3 I_9, \lambda^3 J_9, \lambda^4 I_{12}, \lambda^4 J_{12}, \lambda^5 I_{15}, \lambda^5 J_{15}, \lambda^6 I_{18}, \lambda^6 J_{18}, \lambda^7 I_{21}, \lambda^7 J_{21}, \lambda^9 I_{27}). \tag{2.36}$$

We can now find the prime factors p of I_3 and look at the valuations at p of each entries of $\underline{\mathrm{I}}'$. Since for an invariant I of degree $3n$, we have that

$$I\left(pF\left(\frac{x}{p}, y, z\right)\right) = p^{3n} I\left(F\left(\frac{x}{p}, y, z\right)\right) = p^{3n} p^{-4n} I(F) = \frac{I(F)}{p^n} \tag{2.37}$$

by this procedure, we can reduce the valuations at p of these invariants by

$$(1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 6, 6, 7, 7, 9),$$

respectively. Applying this as much as possible while preserving positive valuation, we find

$$\underline{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{min}} = (2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 23 : 2^3 \cdot 3967 : 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 41 \cdot 173 \cdot 19309 : \cdots : 2^5 \cdot 3^{27} \cdot 19^7). \tag{2.38}$$

Note that we cannot always get a representative with coprime entries (here 2 divides all the entries).

3. Optimized reconstruction

Having the Dixmier–Ohno invariants at our disposal, it remains to reconstruct a corresponding plane quartic curve X over the field of moduli, which in the cases under consideration is always the field $\mathbb{Q}$. It was indicated in [46] how such a reconstruction can be obtained; however, the corresponding algorithms, the precursors of those currently at [45], were suboptimal in several ways. To start with, they would typically return a curve over a quadratic extension of the base field, without performing a further descent. Secondly, the coefficients of these reconstructed models were typically of gargantuan size. In this section we describe the improvements to the algorithms, incorporated in the present version of [45], that enabled us to obtain the simple equations in this paper.

The basic ingredients are the following. A descent to the base field can be found by determining an isomorphism of X with its conjugate and applying an effective version of Hilbert's Theorem 90, as was also mentioned in [46]. After this, a reduction algorithm can be applied, based on algorithms by Elsenhans [15] and Stoll [57] that have been implemented and combined in the Magma function `MinimizeReducePlaneQuartic`. However, applying these two steps concurrently is an overly naive approach, since the descent step blows up the coefficients by an unacceptable factor. We therefore have to look under the hood of our reconstruction algorithms and use some tricks to optimize them.

Recall from [46] that the reconstruction algorithm finds a quartic form F by first constructing a triple (b_8, b_4, b_0) of binary forms of degree 8, 4 and 0. Our first step is to reconstruct the form b_8 as efficiently as possible. This form is reconstructed from its Shioda invariants $\underline{S}$, which are algebraically obtained from the given Dixmier–Ohno invariants $\underline{I}$. Starting from the invariants $\underline{S}$, the methods of [41] are applied, which furnish a conic C and a quartic H in $\mathbb{P}^2$ that are both defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. This pair corresponds to b_8 in the sense that over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ the divisor $C \cap H$ on C can be transformed into the divisor cut out by b_8 on $\mathbb{P}^1$. A priority in this reconstruction step is to find a conic C defined by a form whose discriminant is as small as possible.

3.1. Choosing the right conic for Mestre reconstruction.

Let k be a number field whose rings of integers $\mathcal{O}_k$ admits an effective extended GCD algorithm, which is for example the case when $\mathcal{O}_k$ is a Euclidean ring. We indicate how over such a field we can improve the algorithms developed to reconstruct a hyperelliptic curve from its Igusa or Shioda invariants in genus 2 or genus 3 respectively [47, 40, 41].

Recall that Mestre's method for hyperelliptic reconstruction is based on Clebsch's identities [41, Sec.2.1]. It uses three binary covariants $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3)$ of order 2, which can be seen as binary quadratic forms over the ring of invariants. From these forms, one can construct a plane conic $C_q : \sum_{1 \le i,j \le 3} A_{i,j} x_i x_j = 0$ and a degree $g+1$ plane curve H_q over the ring of invariants. Here g is the genus of the curve that we wish to reconstruct.

Given a tuple of values of hyperelliptic invariants over k, we can substitute to obtain a conic and a curve that we again denote by C_q and H_q. Generically, one then recovers a hyperelliptic curve X with the given invariants by constructing the double cover of C_q ramified over $C_q \cap H_q$. Because the coefficients of the original

universal forms C_q and H_q are in the ring of invariants, the substituted forms will be defined over k.

Finding a model of X of the form $y^2 = f(x)$ over k (also called a *hyperelliptic model*) is equivalent to finding a k-rational point on the conic C_q by [41, 43]. Algorithms to find such a rational point exist [55, 65] and their complexity is dominated by the time spent to factorize the discriminant of an integral model of C_q. While a hyperelliptic model may not exist over k, it can always be found over some quadratic extension of k. It is useful to have such an extension given by a small discriminant, which is in particular the case when C_q has small discriminant. Accordingly, we turn to the problem of minimizing $\mathrm{disc}(C_q)$.

In order to do so, we use a beautiful property of Clebsch's identities. By [41, Sec.2.1.(5)], we have that

$$\mathrm{disc}(C_q) = \det((A_{i,j})_{1\leq i,j\leq 3}) = R_q^2/2 \tag{3.1}$$

where R_q is the determinant of q_1, q_2, q_3 in the basis x^2, xz, z^2. If q_3' is now another covariant of order 2, we can consider the *family* of covariants

$$q_{\lambda,\mu} = (q_1, q_2, \lambda q_3 + \mu q_3'), \quad \lambda, \mu \in k.$$

For this family, the multilinearity of the determinant shows that

$$R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}} = \lambda R_{q_1,q_2,q_3} + \mu R_{q_1,q_2,q_3'}. \tag{3.2}$$

The values R_{q_1,q_2,q_3} and $R_{q_1,q_2,q_3'}$ are invariants that can be effectively computed and which are generically non-zero. (In the complementary case, one can often find a reconstruction by using different covariants q_i; if that also fails, then typically X has large reduced automorphism group and other techniques can be used.) The key point is that we can minimize the value of $R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$, and by (3.1) the value of $\mathrm{disc}(C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}})$ with it, by using the extended Euclidean algorithm to minimize the combined linear contribution of λ and μ to the linear expression $R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$. This allows us to reduce the discriminant all the way to $\gcd(R_{q_1,q_2,q_3}, R_{q_1,q_2,q_3'})$ or beyond.

Note that we do not have $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}} = \lambda^2 C_{q_1,q_2,q_3} + \mu^2 C_{q_1,q_2,q_3'}$. However, the coefficients of the family of conics $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ and of H_{q_λ} can be quickly found in terms of the invariants and λ, μ by using the same interpolation techniques as in [41, Sec. 2.3].

Example 3.3. In genus 3, with the notation of [41, Table 1], consider the quadratic covariants $q_1 = C_{5,2}$, $q_2 = C_{6,2}$, $q_3 = C_{7,2}$ and $q_3' = C_{7,2}'$ of respective degrees 5, 6, 7 and 7. We first calculate $R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ by evaluation-interpolation and obtain, up to a multiplicative constant, that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}} = {} & (-7779313664640\,\lambda - 170239999104000\,\mu)\,{S_9}^2 \\ & + (11286578620800\,\lambda + 12808121760000\,\mu)\,S_8\,S_{10} \\ & + (-54772200\,\lambda - 698544000\,\mu){S_2}^4{S_3}^2S_4 + \cdots \\ & + (58538634\,\lambda + 480082400\,\mu){S_2}^6S_6 + (912870\,\lambda + 11642400\,\mu)\,{S_2}^7S_4\,. \end{aligned}$$

(The coefficients are too large for all of them to be written here.) Similarly, we find that a defining equation of the conic $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & (27653197824000\,S_{10} - 3456649728000\,{S_5}^2 + 5442851635200\,S_4\,S_6 \\ & \quad - 1152216576000\,S_3\,S_7 + 1152216576000\,S_2\,S_8 + 128024064000\,{S_3}^2S_4 \\ & \quad + 636462489600\,S_2\,{S_4}^2 - 4267468800\,{S_2}^3S_4)\,x^2 + \\ & \cdots + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&((-122472000\,\lambda^2+31352832000\,\lambda\mu-2006581248000\,\mu^2)\,{S_7}^2\\&\quad+(13158391680\,\lambda^2-50077440000\,\lambda\mu+12192768000\,\mu^2)\,{S_2}^2S_{10}\\&\quad+(-10191303360\,\lambda^2+87722611200\,\lambda\mu-182891520000\,\mu^2)\,S_2\,S_5\,S_7\\&\quad+\cdots+(-1963725120\,\lambda^2-3584448000\,\lambda\mu+47674368000\,\mu^2)\,S_2\,{S_3}^2S_6\\&\quad+(46892895840\,\lambda^2-129635251200\,\lambda\mu-264757248000\,\mu^2)\,S_2\,S_4\,S_8)\,z^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

As expected, the coefficients of the monomials x^2, $x\,y$, y^2 (resp. $x\,z$, $y\,z$ and z^2) are of degree 0 (resp. degree 1 and 2) in λ and μ . The degree 4 plane curve $H_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&(6587722028852923070144774894124426854400000000\,{S_7}^3\\&\quad-31230682210858301962167821720293579161600000000\,S_6\,S_7\,S_8\\&\quad-22312730203230954191077833304965120000 0\,{S_2}^7S_7\cdots\\&\quad-24791922448034393545642037005516800000\,{S_2}^7S_3\,S_4\\&\quad-74375767344103180636926111016550400000\,{S_2}^8S_5)\,x^4+\\&\cdots+\\&((6801859338812836058229320641866604523657625600\,\lambda^4\\&\quad-11652598607816867508964974465445377522165350400 0\,\lambda^3\mu\\&\quad+85809478422679667982790667970596994533031936000 0\,\lambda^2\mu^2\\&\quad-28199940429630013975407514237627473617485824000 00\,\lambda\mu^3\\&\quad+33248963223270957144623815185973833734553600000 00\,\mu^4)S_9\,{S_{10}}^2\\&\quad+476575830803581239296000 0\,\lambda\mu^3\\&\quad-23616752827345672863932743680000 0\,\mu^4)S_2{}^{11}S_3\,S_4\\&\quad+\cdots+(-44897036826229287913061078630 40\,\lambda^4\\&\quad+63651495247312408180542288691200\,\lambda^3\mu\\&\quad-33840035447938242323832609177600 0\,\lambda^2\mu^2\\&\quad+79959577429727492410743717888000 0\,\lambda\mu^3\\&\quad-70850258482037018591798231040000 0\,\mu^4)S_2{}^{12}S_5)\,z^4.\end{aligned}$$

In this case the coefficients of the monomials $x^iy^jz^k$ are of degree k in λ and μ.

3.2. **Reconstruction of a plane quartic model from the invariants.** With these precomputations out of the way, we now search for a binary octic form b_8 whose Shioda invariants come from the first step of the reconstruction algorithm of [46] applied to the Dixmier–Ohno invariants of case 15 (*cf.* Table 1). Except for this case and case 6, all the other cases give conics C with no rational point and as such, a descent phase is needed to find a rational quartic (*cf.* Section 3.3). Case 15 is the easiest CM plane quartic that we have to reconstruct. Its Shioda invariants are

$$\begin{aligned}19\cdot S_2&=-2^{10}\cdot3^2\cdot5\cdot7\cdot1157503\cdot5499509\,,\\19\cdot S_3&=-2^{13}\cdot3^7\cdot5\cdot163\cdot401\cdot21045616999111\,,\\19^2\cdot S_4&=2^{15}\cdot3^3\cdot5^4\cdot37\cdot67\cdot1211106530017\cdot2070216948817\,,\\19^2\cdot S_5&=2^{19}\cdot3^5\cdot5^5\cdot12751159\cdot69766513\cdot138947111\cdot23081737537\,,\\19^3\cdot S_6&=-2^{23}\cdot3^4\cdot5^5\cdot11\cdot13\cdot343016997823\cdot3684843852977303253578600521\,,\\19^2\cdot S_7&=2^{26}\cdot3^6\cdot5^5\cdot173\cdot547\cdot3823411\cdot82628459\cdot2049122743223\cdot3378059849656039\,,\\7\cdot19^4\cdot S_8&=2^{30}\cdot3^9\cdot5^5\cdot241\cdot521\cdot6017373276863647\cdot2576544930853662586729960700171101 07\,,\\19^4\cdot S_9&=2^{34}\cdot3^7\cdot5^8\cdot17\cdot929\cdot7103\cdot65963\cdot627881563587555405275812629835482867518349961550 3\,,\\7\cdot19^5\cdot S_{10}&=2^{38}\cdot3^{10}\cdot5^8\cdot241\cdot962529234691091137440584920324 21\cdot1957154298822750905444259096562026 29\,.\end{aligned}$$

We first evaluate $R_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ at these invariants to find

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{61}\cdot3^{18}\cdot5^{12}\cdot7^4\cdot31^2\cdot9091\cdot201049\cdot\\&\quad(8189582497759889248904941300 66\cdots691544995339187743171958751200845 13\,\lambda+\\&\quad1036518152288727229991414175 85\cdots877602827586830765379864025863684592 0\,\mu)\,.\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

By using the extended GCD algorithm and substituting the result for λ and μ, we are left with R_q equal to the left hand side coefficient $2^{61}\cdot3^{18}\cdots201049$. This factor is almost equal to the Dixmier–Ohno invariant I_{12}, the discriminant of the covariant used in our quartic reconstruction. Indeed, we know that our reconstruction

algorithm fail when $I_{12} = 0$ and this failure takes place in Mestre's method to construct b_8. Hence the primes which divide I_{12} naturally appear in the discriminants of $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$. So a substantial further improvement cannot be expected.

Now as we know the factorization of R_q, we can efficiently determine if the conic $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ has a rational point. Unexpectedly, it has one, and after a change of variable we map it to the point $(1 : 1 : 0)$. The conic is then $C = x^2 - y^2 - z^2$ and the corresponding quartic is

$$\begin{aligned} H = {} & 250530186983286014344232350967386106083425610524979 96\, x^4 \\ & - 10802911185734290735143876595627033115695191523965 28\, x^3\, y \\ & - 10020625182831521491261274635322907985881827195884 9712\, x^3\, z \\ & + 17468387470089181557428904029475158717980902078012\, x^2\, y^2 \\ & + 32406850401688526247618412740646551451668943347662 16\, x^2\, y\, z \\ & + 15030064380250151942498198167640218849133738541290 9964\, x^2\, z^2 \\ & - 12554005350882678191463121473508831689976170924 0\, x\, y^3 \\ & - 34934744889226399626760730711617539516239295484680\, x\, y^2\, z \\ & - 32404967355597607401974190850439046697578581720618 64\, x\, y\, z^2 \\ & - 10019460691335213944607049277632520734564619219368 8152\, x\, z^3 \\ & + 33833199541097285485948191569659486179066155 9\, y^4 \\ & + 12553275882562609490292097162917828359052851218 0\, y^3\, z \\ & + 17466357478116715720299747137980979148810158108658\, y^2\, z^2 \\ & + 10801028139641252488257108370499225367720409164098 92\, y\, z^3 \\ & + 25047196240837233784876946988210701252031429209133551\, z^4\,. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it remains to compute the geometric intersection $C \cap H$. This yields the octic

$$\begin{aligned} b_8 = {} & 28559892463179721314724691152200364 7\, x^8 \\ & - 42388024850926698406059877688414656456 8\, x^7\, y \\ & + 27523765570451696212724679230257490194262 0\, x^6\, y^2 \\ & - 10212556480961816394340348274046632926475884 0\, x^5\, y^3 \\ & + 23683239678768099840163734098761640325346309130\, x^4\, y^4 \\ & - 35150193726823402754457306090997324068640630998 80\, x^3\, y^5 \\ & + 32605761924135071888761711543567716112080832646630 0\, x^2\, y^6 \\ & - 17283151416532335374598717711442371326532625151269000\, x\, y^7 \\ & + 40080171748333470900296540289090578755617583982707937 5\, y^8\,. \end{aligned}$$

The forms b_0 and b_4 computed by the plane quartic reconstruction algorithm [46] are therefore defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ as well. By applying the linear map $(\ell^*)^{-1}$ defined in loc. cit., we get a plane quartic defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ too. It remains to reduce the size of its coefficients as explained in Section 3.3 to obtain the equation given in Section 5.

3.3. **Descent and minimization.** Now suppose that we have in this way found a minimal pair (C, H) above. We can then further optimize this pair by applying the following two steps:

(i) Minimize the defining equation of C by using the theory of quaternion algebras (implemented in the Magma function `MinimalModel`);
(ii) Apply the reduction theory of point clusters [57] applied to the intersection $C \cap H$ (implemented in the Magma function `ReduceCluster`).

The second step above is more or less optional; typically it leads to a rather better H at the cost of a slightly worse C. Regardless, at the end of this procedure, we can construct a binary form b_8 over a quadratic extension K of $\mathbb{Q}$ by parametrizing the conic C, and we then reconstruct b_4 and b_0 as in [46]. The associated ternary quartic form F is usually defined over a quadratic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. Since its covariant $\rho(F)$ from [46] is a multiple of $y^2 - xz$, we can immediately apply the construction

from [63] to obtain an element $[M] \in \mathrm{PGL}_3(K)$ that up to a scalar λ transforms F into its conjugate $\sigma(F)$:

$$[\sigma(F)] = [F.M] \tag{3.5}$$

In the cases under consideration we know that the curve defined by F descends because of the triviality of its automorphism group. This implies that the cocycle defined by the class $[M]$ lifts to $\mathrm{GL}_3(K)$. Explicitly, let $M \in \mathrm{GL}_3(K)$ be some representative of the class $[M]$. Then we have

$$M\sigma(M) = \pi \tag{3.6}$$

for some scalar matrix π. Conjugating this equality shows that in fact $\pi \in \mathbb{Q}$, and taking determinants yields $\delta\sigma(\delta) = \pi^3$, where δ is the determinant of M. Now let $M_0 = (\pi/\delta)M$. Then we have

$$M_0\sigma(M_0) = \frac{\pi}{\delta} M \frac{\sigma(\pi)}{\sigma(\delta)}\sigma(M) = \frac{\pi\sigma(\pi)\pi}{\delta\sigma(\delta)} = \frac{\pi^3}{\delta\sigma(\delta)} = 1. \tag{3.7}$$

We may therefore assume that $M \in GL_3(K)$ corresponds to a lifted cocycle. The Galois cohomology group $H^1(\mathrm{Gal}(K\,|\,\mathbb{Q}), \mathrm{GL}_3(K))$ is trivial; Hilbert's Theorem 90 can be used to construct a coboundary N for M, that is, a matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_3(K)$ for which

$$M\sigma(N) = N. \tag{3.8}$$

After choosing a random matrix $R \in \mathrm{GL}_3(K)$, one can in fact take

$$N = R + M\sigma(R). \tag{3.9}$$

We thus obtain a coboundary N corresponding to the cocycle M. If we put $F_0 = F.N$, then the class $[F_0]$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Note that typically the form F_0 is at first not defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, but this can be achieved by dividing it by one of its coefficients.

A complication is that the determinant of such a random matrix N typically has a rather involved factorization. These factors can (and usually will) later show up as places of bad reduction of the descended form F_0. It is therefore imperative to avoid a bad factorization structure of the determinant of N. This, however, can be ensured by performing a lazy factorization of this determinant and passing to a next random choice if the result is not satisfactory.

After we have obtained a form F_0, one can apply the Magma function `ReduceMinimizePlaneQuartic`; this function combines a discriminant minimization step due to Elsenhans in [15] with the reduction theory of Stoll in [57]. Typically the first of these steps leads to the most significant reduction of the coefficient size, since it applies a suitable transformation in $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{Q})$ whose determinant is a large prime, whereas the cluster reduction step is a further optimization involving only the subgroup $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{Z})$. As mentioned above, we can save some time in the minimization step by carrying over the primes in the factorization of the determinant of the coboundary N, since these will recur in the set of bad primes of F_0.

All in all, we get the following randomized algorithm whose heuristic complexity is polynomial in the size of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants, if we assume that the factorizations of I_{12} and I_{27} are known, and that $\det N$ behaves as a random integer.

Algorithm 3.10 (Integral plane quartic reconstruction from its Diximier-Ohno invariants $\underline{I}$ when the factorizations of I_{12} and I_{27} are known)**.**

(i) Repeat until $N \neq 0$ and the full factorization of $\det(N)$ is known.
  (a) Calculate the Shioda invariants $\underline{S}$ of b_8 *(as explained in* [41]*)*;
  (b) Evaluate the conic $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ at $\underline{S}$ and determine (λ, μ) by using the extended Euclidean algorithm *(so that* $\operatorname{disc} C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}} \simeq I_{12}$*, see Section 3.1)*;
  (c) Choose a point P on the conic $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ and use it to parametrize the conic;
  (Set P to be any rational point of $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ if it exists. Otherwise intersect C_q with a random rational line with a defining equation of small height and set P to be the generic point in the quadratic field defined by the intersection)
  (d) Intersect $C_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ and $H_{q_{\lambda,\mu}}$ to obtain the octic b_8, then calculate the forms b_4 and b_0 and reconstruct a quartic F via the map ℓ^*.
  (e) If F is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ then set N to be the identity matrix of $\mathrm{GL}(3, \mathbb{Q})$, else set N to a random coboundary as on Eq (3.9).
  (f) Try to compute a factorization of $\det N$. If this fails within the allocated time, then start over.
(ii) Let $F_0 = FN$. (Now F_0 has coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$.)
(iii) Reduce the coefficient size of F_0 *(with* `ReduceMinimizePlaneQuartic`*, using the prime factors of* $\det N$ *and* I_{12}*)*.

One important practical speedup for Algorithm 3.10 exploits that the determinants of the random coboundaries that we compute in Step $(i)(e)$ share the same denominator, the one of π/δ defined by equation (3.6) which in this context only depends on the choice of the random line in Step $(i)(c)$. A straightforward optimization is thus to loop over the Steps $(i)(a) - (d)$ until a lazy factorization of the denominator of $\det(1 + M)$ yields its full factorization (note that here M is the cocycle defined by equation (3.5) and $1 + M = R + M\sigma(R)$ for R the identity matrix). Once done, we can loop over the Steps $(i)(e) - (i)(f)$ to test as many coboundaries $N = R + M\sigma(R)$ from random integral matrices R as needed, until the lazy factorization of the denominator of $\det N$ is also in fact its full factorization.

In the most difficult case, i.e., case 16 (*cf.* Table 1), the candidates for $\det N$ have approximately 500-digit denominators and 700-digit numerators. If we allow less than second for the lazy factorization Magma routine, then the total computation in the end takes less than 5 minutes on a laptop. In this case, the descended form $F_0 = F.N$ has 1500-digit coefficients! Once the discriminant minimization steps from [15] are done for each prime divisor of $\det N$, we are left with a form that "merely" has 50-digit coefficients. Stoll's reduction method [57] then finally yields the 15-digit equation given in Section 5.

Remark 3.11. Bouyer and Streng [7, Algorithm 4.8] show how one can avoid factoring in the discriminant minimization of binary forms. Such a trick enabled them to eliminate the need for a loop like that in Step (i) of Algorithm 3.10 when considering curves of genus 2. It remains to be seen whether a similar trick applies to Elsenhans's [15] discriminant minimization of plane quartics. If it does, then that would greatly speed up the reconstruction.

4. Remarks on the results

Our (heuristic) results can be found in the next and concluding section; here we discuss some of their properties, as well as perform some sanity checks. The very

particular pattern of the factorization of the discriminants is a good indicator of the correctness of our computations. Note that as the Dixmier–Ohno invariants that we use involve denominators with prime factors in $\{2, 3, 5, 7\}$, the valuation of our invariants at these primes are less likely to be arithmetically meaningful. However, we do hope to show in future work that the Dixmier–Ohno invariants still generate the invariant ring in characteristic ≥ 11.

Remark 4.1. That said, the discriminant I_{27} does have good arithmetic properties at all primes except 2. Indeed, the definition we use (and implemented by Kohel in his MAGMA package `Echidna`) is equal to -2^{-40} times the discriminant defined in [18, Chap.13.1.D].

4.1. **Bounds on primes in discriminants.** As was mentioned in the introduction, a motivation for computing this list was also to have examples in hand to understand the possible generalization of the results of Goren–Lauter [20] in genus 2 to non-hyperelliptic curves of genus 3. In genus 2, all primes dividing the discriminant are primes of bad reduction for the curve. This bad reduction gives a lot of information on the structure of the endomorphism ring of the reduction of the Jacobian. This particular structure allows one, with additional work, to bound the primes dividing the discriminant. Taking this even further allowed Lauter–Viray [38] to find out exactly which prime powers divide the discriminant. When using normalized Igusa invariants j with only power of the discriminant I_{10} in the denominator (such as $j = I_4^5/I_{10}^2$), one can use [38] or its implementation in [58] to compute a denominator $D \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ of the minimal polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ of $j(\tau) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \mathbb{C}$. Multiplying a numerical approximation $\widetilde{p}$ of p with this denominator, one could replace the use of `BestApproximation` by a simple rounding of the coefficients of $D \cdot \widetilde{p}$ to the nearest integer. Moreover, combining this with interval arithmetic allows one to get a provably terminating algorithm for computing genus-two class polynomials and CM curves as done by Bouyer and Streng [59, 7, 58]. Similar bounds on primes dividing the discriminant have been obtained by Kılıçer–Lauter–Lorenzo–Newton–Ozman–Streng for hyperelliptic [27] and Picard [27, 28] curves.

For "generic" genus 3 non-hyperelliptic CM curves, the situation is more involved. Given a smooth plane quartic X over $\mathbb{Q}$, we define the *minimal discriminant* $\Delta^{\min}(X)$ to be the discriminant of a global minimal model of X, as found by [15]. The results in [27] describe the primes of bad reduction of X. While primes of bad reduction divide $\Delta^{\min}(X)$, the converse does not hold, and for the curves in our list a large proportion of primes that divide $\Delta^{\min}(X)$ are in fact primes of potential good reduction.

The reasons for this phenomenon are twofold. The first is that X may have smooth plane quartic reduction that only shows up after an extension of the base field; this case is studied in Section 4.2. The second is that the (potential) good reduction of a smooth plane quartic curve X need no longer be a smooth plane quartic itself: we say that X over a number field K has *hyperelliptic reduction* at a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_K$ of K if there exists a (flat, proper) model X over the localization $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ such that the special fiber $\mathsf{X} \otimes (\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})$ is a smooth hyperelliptic curve of genus 3. This case is considered in Section 4.3.

Since the curves X that we consider are CM curves, their Jacobian has potentially good reduction at all primes. Therefore, X has bad reduction at a prime if and only if the Jacobian of X reduces to a product of two sub-abelian varieties

with a decomposable principal polarization. The locus of such abelian threefolds is of codimension 2 in the moduli space of principally polarized abelian threefolds, whereas the locus of Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves has codimension 1. We therefore expect that "most" of the primes dividing the minimal discriminant of a CM plane quartic are primes of hyperelliptic reduction.

To be able to distinguish these possibilities in terms of valuations of the Dixmier–Ohno invariants is work in progress. Once this is done, it will still be challenging to get a closed formula for these primes simply in terms of the CM-type and polarization. Indeed, we see no link between hyperelliptic reduction and the structure of the endomorphism ring of the reduction (see Section 4.4). Therefore, to get information about the primes dividing I_{27}, one would need new ideas about how to read off hyperelliptic reduction.

A look at the curves that we computed confirms that this case will be more difficult than the case of genus 2. In each case we factor the minimal I_{27} as $a \cdot b^{14}$ with b as large as possible without prime factors $p < 11$. Then the largest prime factor of a that we encounter in our list is 83. In other words, it seems to be the case that the number a is usually smooth, just like the discriminants in the genus-2 CM, hyperelliptic and Picard cases. By contrast, the factorization pattern of the number b seems to fit with that of a random integer of size b. For example, in case 16 we have $b = 37 \cdot 79 \cdot 13373064392147$.

Remark 4.2. In [27] bounds for the primes with bad reduction are given. However, from the list that we obtain, the largest one is 83, which is far smaller than the bounds in loc. cit. suggest.

4.2. **Minimized invariants and minimal discriminant.** There is a difference between the set of primes that divide $I_{27}^{\min}$ after the minimization at the end of Section 2.2 and the set of primes that occur in $\Delta^{\min}(X)$. While the Dixmier-Ohno invariants are equal as elements of a weighted projective space, in general there will not exist an integral form $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ that defines X whose invariants are exactly equal to the normalized ones. For example, our integral model for X_9 was reduced by Elsenhans' minimization routine [15], so we know it to be minimal. Yet its discriminant is 0 modulo 13. Therefore there exists no quartic form over $\mathbb{Z}$ corresponding to the normalized invariants, which all have valuation 0 at 13. But over an extension ramified at 13, namely $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[3]{13})$, there exists an integral model whose invariants all have trivial valuation. Indeed, under the change of variables

$$x = \sqrt[3]{13}^2 x_1 + 5\sqrt[3]{13} x_2,\ y = \sqrt[3]{13} x_2,\ z = x_3 \tag{4.3}$$

we have that X_9 is defined by the quartic form

$$\begin{aligned} &-96128\ \sqrt[3]{13}^2\, x_1^4 - 2155364\ \sqrt[3]{13}\, x_1^3 x_2 - 5588\, x_1^3 x_3 - 17962593\, x_1^2 x_2^2 \\ &\quad - 3600\ \sqrt[3]{13}^2\, x_1^2 x_2 x_3 + 445492\ \sqrt[3]{13}\, x_1^2 x_3^2 - 5071478\ \sqrt[3]{13}^2\, x_1 x_2^3 \\ &\quad + 12\ \sqrt[3]{13}\, x_1 x_2^2 x_3 + 4989322\, x_1 x_2 x_3^2 + 1268\ \sqrt[3]{13}^2\, x_1 x_3^3 - 6916605\ \sqrt[3]{13}\, x_2^4 \\ &\quad + 81084\, x_2^3 x_3 + 1047826\ \sqrt[3]{13}^2\, x_2^2 x_3^2 - 5168\ \sqrt[3]{13}\, x_2 x_3^3 - 515397\, x_3^4 \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

which has the desired properties. This means in particular that the curve X_9 has bad but potentially good reduction at 13. For the curves X in our list, we observed the same phenomenon for the other primes greater than 7 that appear in the quotient $\Delta^{\min}(X)/I_{27}^{\min}$, and we expect this property to generalize.

4.3. **Proving hyperelliptic reduction.** For now, let us just mention that for our models we can explicitly calculate that the primes $p > 7$ with exponent 14 in the minimal discriminant of the curves in our list are in fact primes of hyperelliptic reduction. For instance, modulo 79 the curve X_9 has a model with hyperelliptic reduction

$$y^2 = 5x^8 + 44x^7 + 54x^6 + 73x^5 + 18x^4 + 9x^3 + 72x^2 + 51x + 1. \tag{4.5}$$

The observation that explains the exponent 14, and that allows us the find these reductions, is the following. Let X be a plane quartic over $\mathbb{Q}$ defined by a globally minimal polynomial $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ of degree 4. Suppose that we have $F = C^2 + pG$ with C, $G \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ homogeneous of degree 2, 4. By [14, p.82], if C defines a non-degenerate conic $\overline{C}$ modulo p whose intersection B with the zero locus of G modulo p has degree 8, then X has hyperelliptic reduction modulo p. Moreover, the degree 2 cover of $\overline{C}$ ramified over B is the special fiber of the corresponding model at p.

A computation shows that the existence of such a model implies that p^{14} divides $\Delta^{\min}(X)$. The converse does not necessarily hold, as one may need to take an extension of the base field to obtain a model as in [14]. This is for example the case for the Klein quartic. Indeed, the (minimal) discriminant of $x^3y + y^3z + z^3x = 0$ is $-7^7/2^{40}$ but the curve is isomorphic over $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})$ to

$$x^4 + y^4 + z^4 + \frac{-3 + 3\sqrt{-7}}{2}(x^2y^2 + y^2z^2 + z^2x^2) = 0 \tag{4.6}$$

and the latter is now the square of a quadric modulo $\sqrt{-7}$. Similar transformations turn out to work for all of our curves X_i and all primes p with exponent 14, at least when $p \neq 7$.

4.4. **On supersingular and ordinary reduction.** The following lemma gives information about the reduction of CM abelian threefolds modulo primes.

Lemma 4.7. *Let A be an abelian variety over a number field k and suppose that A has CM by $\mathcal{O}_K$ for a sextic cyclic CM field K. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}_k$ be a prime lying over a rational prime p. Let n be the number of prime factors of $p\mathcal{O}_K$.*

Then possibly after extending k, the following holds for the reduction $\overline{A}$ of A modulo $\mathfrak{p}$.

We have $\overline{A} \sim B^d$ where B is absolutely simple and

(i) *If $n = 2$, then $d = 1$, $\overline{A} = B$ is absolutely simple, and $\mathrm{End}(\overline{A}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is a central simple division algebra of reduced degree 3 over the imaginary quadratic subfield of K, ramified exactly at the two primes over p of K_1.*

(ii) *If $n = 6$, then $d = 1$, $\overline{A} = B$ is absolutely simple, and $\mathrm{End}(\overline{A}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \cong K$.*

(iii) *In all other cases, we have $d = 3$, $\overline{A}$ is supersingular, $\mathrm{End}(B_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is the quaternion algebra $B_{p,\infty}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ ramified only at p and infinity, and $\mathrm{End}(\overline{A}_{\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is the 3×3 matrix algebra over $B_{p,\infty}$.*

If A is the Jacobian of a curve, then in cases (i) and (ii) the curve has potential good reduction. (In case (iii) both good and bad reduction can occur.)

Proof. By a theorem of Serre and Tate [51], the abelian variety A has potential good reduction. Extend k so that it has good reduction and so that k contains the reflex field. The Shimura–Taniyama formula [54, Theorem 1(ii) in Section 13.1]

then gives a formula for the Frobenius endomorphism of the reduction as an element $\pi\mathcal{O}_K$ up to units. A theorem in Honda–Tate theory [60, Théorème 1] then gives a formula for the endomorphism algebra in terms of this π. We did the computation for all possible splitting types of a prime in a cyclic sextic number field and found the above-mentioned endomorphism algebras over some finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Moreover, we found that the endomorphism algebra from loc. cit. in our cases does not change when taking powers of π (i.e., extending k and the extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$ further), so that these are indeed the endomorphism algebras over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

Finally, suppose further that $A = J(X)$ and X does not have potential good reduction. Then by [6, Corollary 4.3], we get that the reduction of A is not absolutely simple, which gives a contradiction in cases (i) and (ii). □

Example 4.8. Let us once again consider X_9. The discriminant of our model is $-2^{15} \cdot 5^{12} \cdot 7^{14} \cdot 13^{18} \cdot 79^{14} \cdot 233^{14} \cdot 857^{14}$. Let K be the CM field of case 9. The prime 2 is the square of a prime of $\mathcal{O}_K$, the primes 5 and 79 each are a product of three primes of $\mathcal{O}_K$, the prime 7 is inert, and the prime 13 is the third power of a prime of $\mathcal{O}_K$. In particular, these five primes are of supersingular reduction for the Jacobian of X_9. As we have seen above, X_9 has potentially good plane quartic reduction at 13, and hyperelliptic reduction at 79.

The primes 233 and 857 both are totally split and hence the reduction is absolutely simple, with endomorphism ring $\mathcal{O}_K$. Lemma 4.7 show that X_9 has potential good reduction at these primes. Both of them are greater than 7 and do not divide the invariant I_3 of the given model. Therefore, for every plane quartic model at these primes over the ring of integers of a number field, every prime over 233 or 857 of that number field appears in the discriminant. And indeed an explicit calculation shows that X_9 instead has hyperelliptic reduction at these primes.

Remark 4.9. Note that models of good reduction of either the hyperelliptic or plane quartic type are compatible with base extension.

5. Defining equations and invariants

We now display the results that we obtained. The expressions of the invariants of the curves obtained are too unwieldy to be written down completely; in fact in some cases it is even difficult to factor all of them. Here we only show the factorizations of I_3, I_{12} and I_{27}.

Case 1. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6 - 2\,x^5 + 14\,x^4 - 22\,x^3 + 179\,x^2 + 8\,x + 883)$ are

$$I_3 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 43 \cdot 108879238253\,,$$

$$I_{12} = 2^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 59 \cdot 23125172177985775423 \cdot 12268113861312502584169976688917527\,,$$

$$I_{27} = -2^{57} \cdot 3^{27} \cdot 5^{12} \cdot 7^9 \cdot 37^{14} \cdot 15187^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 : {} & -4169\,x^4 - 956\,x^3y + 7440\,x^3z + 55770\,x^2y^2 + 43486\,x^2y\,z \\ & + 42796\,x^2z^2 - 38748\,x\,y^3 - 30668\,x\,y^2z + 79352\,x\,y\,z^2 - 162240\,x\,z^3 \\ & + 6095\,y^4 + 19886\,y^3z - 89869\,y^2z^2 - 1079572\,y\,z^3 - 6084\,z^4 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_1 = 2^{-27} \cdot 3^{-27} \cdot 13^{18} \cdot I_{27}$.

Case 2. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6+15\,x^4+2\,x^3+156\,x^2-48\,x+701)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3\cdot 31\cdot 494843\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^2\cdot 11\cdot 19\cdot 34371214448001275113404852 4747\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29}\cdot 3^{35}\cdot 7^9\cdot 701^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_2 : {} & 19\,x^4+80\,x^3y-54\,x^3z-24\,x^2y^2-34\,x^2y\,z+77\,x^2z^2-88\,x\,y^3-28\,x\,y^2z \\ & +38\,x\,y\,z^2+516\,x\,z^3+30\,y^4-36\,y^3z-135\,y^2z^2+452\,y\,z^3+4\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_2 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-27}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 3. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-16\,x^5-17\,x^4+538\,x^3+4076\,x^2+8816\,x+24389)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3^2\cdot 17\cdot 137\cdot 136407710705989\,,$$
$$\begin{aligned} I_{12} = {} & -2^2\cdot 3^2\cdot 7^3\cdot 17\cdot 186700785653\cdot 136149878072282929 \\ & \cdot 1725701957040133489\cdot 16001863649069051756767\,, \end{aligned}$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29}\cdot 3^{36}\cdot 5^{36}\cdot 7^7\cdot 233^{14}\cdot 356399^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_3 : {} & -1210961\,x^4+5202144\,x^3y+408700\,x^3z-2479108\,x^2y^2+1908050\,x^2y\,z \\ & +8367272\,x^2z^2-4393072\,x\,y^3-6944000\,x\,y^2z+6772756\,x\,y\,z^2+10594064\,x\,z^3 \\ & +4978166\,y^4-8342100\,y^3z+4611839\,y^2z^2+14080572\,y\,z^3-1387684\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_3 = -2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 31^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 5. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5-38\,x^4-22\,x^3+1115\,x^2+3076\,x+9983)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3\cdot 41\cdot 367\cdot 152899\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^2\cdot 7^3\cdot 719\cdot 1543\cdot 274061\cdot 346439\cdot 576016112015236536559\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29}\cdot 3^{51}\cdot 7^7\cdot 37^{14}\cdot 127^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_5 : {} & 115\,x^4-766\,x^3y-1336\,x^3z+1205\,x^2y^2+5178\,x^2y\,z+4040\,x^2z^2+8216\,x\,y^3+1322\,x\,y^2z \\ & -9484\,x\,y\,z^2+1144\,x\,z^3-8094\,y^4+9032\,y^3z+9669\,y^2z^2-6292\,y\,z^3-4706\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_5 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-27}\cdot 13^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 6. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-8\,x^5-41\,x^4+146\,x^3+2108\,x^2+5032\,x+14813)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3\cdot 313\cdot 6563\cdot 12097\cdot 67410751\,,$$
$$\begin{aligned} I_{12} = {} & 2^2\cdot 7^3\cdot 10166507189\cdot 8465352310073\cdot 77367694856489659957 \\ & \cdot 13766696720007394433231320344653\,, \end{aligned}$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29}\cdot 3^{51}\cdot 7^7\cdot 17^{12}\cdot 127^{14}\cdot 211^{14}\cdot 20707^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_6 : {} & 1444\,x^4-3134924\,x^3y+5002016\,x^3z+2321857\,x^2y^2+2257732\,x^2y\,z \\ & +1585968\,x^2z^2-3166884\,x\,y^3+6283512\,x\,y^2z+1014570\,x\,y\,z^2-4791852\,x\,z^3 \\ & +3312514\,y^4-7211392\,y^3z+19540084\,y^2z^2-10746888\,y\,z^3+4167513\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_6 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-27}\cdot 19^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 7. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5-26\,x^4+74\,x^3+683\,x^2-2192\,x+7883)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3^2\cdot 5\cdot 2467473483989973079\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^2\cdot 3^2\cdot 5\cdot 7^3\cdot 53\cdot 5081\cdot 89926127974276469 \cdot 626790227503972793224609899038338224632952979421592337 7\,,$$
$$I_{27} = -2^{29}\cdot 3^{36}\cdot 5^9\cdot 7^7\cdot 71^{14}\cdot 83^{12}\cdot 17665559^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_7 : -133225\,x^4 - 68935944\,x^3y + 92175713\,x^3z - 21721369\,x^2y^2 + 2990226\,x^2y\,z + 86699691\,x^2z^2 + 18547032\,x\,y^3 + 37568944\,x\,y^2z + 108649086\,x\,y\,z^2 - 259362054\,x\,z^3 + 35272208\,y^4 + 266781024\,y^3z + 140110856\,y^2z^2 - 1192622568\,y\,z^3 + 173418831\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_7 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 7^{18}\cdot 73^{18}\cdot I_{27}\,.$

Case 8. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-4\,x^5+15\,x^4-38\,x^3+232\,x^2-4\,x+1177)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3\cdot 139\cdot 193\cdot 479\,,$$
$$I_{12} = -2^2\cdot 4106191837709367966180759532 5637\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{43}\cdot 3^{27}\cdot 7^{15}\cdot 499^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_8 : 11\,x^4 - 8\,x^3y - 46\,x^3z + 216\,x^2y^2 + 306\,x^2y\,z + 1636\,x^2z^2 - 144\,x\,y^3 + 304\,x\,y^2z + 15726\,x\,y\,z^2 + 7963\,x\,z^3 - 428\,y^4 + 6840\,y^3z - 32779\,y^2z^2 - 16901\,y\,z^3 + 106789\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_8 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-27}\cdot 7^9\cdot 19^{18}\cdot I_{27}\,.$

Case 9. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+17\,x^4-26\,x^3+226\,x^2-8\,x+1201)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3^2\cdot 5\cdot 17\cdot 41\cdot 55579\cdot 115505911\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^2\cdot 3^2\cdot 5^2\cdot 7^3\cdot 37\cdot 58231\cdot 327065146755204829\cdot 98332868209753147459777622056230730942 43\,,$$
$$I_{27} = -2^{42}\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 5^{12}\cdot 7^{14}\cdot 79^{14}\cdot 233^{14}\cdot 857^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_9 : 96128\,x^4 + 232804\,x^3y + 5588\,x^3z + 51333\,x^2y^2 - 37020\,x^2y\,z - 5791396\,x^2z^2 - 108416\,x\,y^3 - 49056\,x\,y^2z - 6947226\,x\,y\,z^2 - 214292\,x\,z^3 - 5880\,y^4 - 581812\,y^3z + 2438436\,y^2z^2 + 1944852\,y\,z^3 + 87102093\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_9 = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 13^{18}\cdot I_{27}\,.$

Case 10. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+21\,x^4-26\,x^3+210\,x^2-148\,x+881)$ are

$$I_3 = 2\cdot 3^2\cdot 5\cdot 159540133\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^2\cdot 3^4\cdot 5\cdot 7^3\cdot 73\cdot 12241\cdot 863454308404225472522636048 9\,,$$
$$I_{27} = -2^{42}\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 7^{14}\cdot 41^{14}\cdot 71^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_{10} : 348\,x^4 - 832\,x^3y - 4\,x^3z + 261\,x^2y^2 - 132\,x^2y\,z - 1680\,x^2z^2 + 224\,x\,y^3 - 168\,x\,y^2z + 1986\,x\,y\,z^2 + 36\,x\,z^3 + 8\,y^4 - 236\,y^3z + 404\,y^2z^2 + 428\,y\,z^3 + 1989\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{10} = 2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot I_{27}\,.$

Case 11. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+5\,x^4+4\,x^3+292\,x^2-512\,x+2848)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= 2\cdot 3^2\cdot 19531\cdot 64579\cdot 63003289\,,\\
I_{12} &= 2^2\cdot 3^2\cdot 7^3\cdot 17\cdot 79091458777\cdot 16621499521889214368325985 3\\
&\quad\cdot 11952739254336686052076730 7193\,,\\
I_{27} &= -2^{72}\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 7^{14}\cdot 23^{14}\cdot 47^{14}\cdot 27527^{14}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{11}:\ & 245137\,x^4+3134444\,x^3y-405198\,x^3z+13885332\,x^2y^2-4713906\,x^2yz\\
&-6576142\,x^2z^2+25220768\,xy^3-13466052\,xy^2z-40450004\,xyz^2+6168379\,xz^3\\
&+16002624\,y^4-12848080\,y^3z-51202207\,y^2z^2+21339374\,yz^3+44888767\,z^4=0
\end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{11}=2^{-27}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 31^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 12. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+30\,x^4-38\,x^3+387\,x^2-268\,x+2003)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= 2^4\cdot 3^3\cdot 17471\cdot 472333\cdot 33066011882791\,,\\
I_{12} &= 2^7\cdot 3^2\cdot 5^4\cdot 7^3\cdot 17\cdot 43\cdot 79\cdot 747669453799\cdot 34021556367175034938581581 03\\
&\quad\cdot 53004705190080041502253594098980472922121052212564677\,,\\
I_{27} &= 2^5\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 7^{14}\cdot 11^9\cdot 5711^{14}\cdot 730642034 93^{14}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{12}:\ & -2283766\,x^4-40282205\,x^3y+65256060\,x^3z+86351004\,x^2y^2-44980176\,x^2yz\\
&-98227040\,x^2z^2+34948793\,xy^3+112406040\,xy^2z-10691928\,xyz^2-811765633\,xz^3\\
&-46977843\,y^4+27242836\,y^3z+210065028\,y^2z^2-159829005\,yz^3-57425706\,z^4=0
\end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{12}=-2^{-45}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 13. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+6\,x^4-32\,x^3+597\,x^2+818\,x+6884)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= 2^4\cdot 3^2\cdot 17\cdot 571\cdot 1971368660864737\,,\\
I_{12} &= 2^{14}\cdot 3^2\cdot 5^3\cdot 4330489\cdot 27756064814226550541679352 9607\\
&\quad\cdot 18504325266482633882313504996231063475658944 1\,,\\
I_{27} &= 2^{29}\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 11^9\cdot 547^{14}\cdot 11827^{14}\cdot 189169^{14}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{13}:\ & 13741849\,x^4-33952358\,x^3y-12314654\,x^3z-79058925\,x^2y^2+321820356\,x^2yz\\
&-449435767\,x^2z^2+24161786\,xy^3+58585032\,xy^2z+184173924\,xyz^2+202615424\,xz^3\\
&+10642401\,y^4+150598482\,y^3z+136602159\,y^2z^2-6607170137\,yz^3+3720024064\,z^4=0
\end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{13}=2^{-45}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 11^{18}\cdot 43^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 14. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-4\,x^5+27\,x^4-70\,x^3+480\,x^2-188\,x+3257)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= 2^4\cdot 3^2\cdot 1267289857525990271\,,\\
I_{12} &= 2^7\cdot 3^5\cdot 5^2\cdot 1249\cdot 22045406596871347628730041 6927\\
&\quad\cdot 41359942606077735474128766609936298363881 07\,,\\
I_{27} &= 2^5\cdot 3^{18}\cdot 11^{19}\cdot 101^{14}\cdot 107^{14}\cdot 8378707^{14}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{14}:\ & 727950\,x^4-1982567\,x^3y-1449460\,x^3z+2619975\,x^2y^2-7272852\,x^2yz\\
&+12943560\,x^2z^2+1222070\,xy^3-9541020\,xy^2z-10154664\,xyz^2+31717821\,xz^3\\
&+3907465\,y^4+7463256\,y^3z+4691252\,y^2z^2+58884154\,yz^3+10671882\,z^4=0
\end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{14}=2^{-45}\cdot 3^{-18}\cdot 19^{18}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 15. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6 - 4\,x^5 + 51\,x^4 - 134\,x^3 + 1264\,x^2 - 940\,x + 12313)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 23\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^7 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 9091 \cdot 201049\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^5 \cdot 3^{27} \cdot 19^7\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_{15} : x^4 - x^3y + 2\,x^3z + 2\,x^2y\,z + 2\,x^2z^2 - 2\,x\,y^2z + 4\,x\,y\,z^2 - y^3z + 3\,y^2z^2 + 2\,y\,z^3 + z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{15} = 2^{-45} \cdot 3^{-27} \cdot I_{27}$.

Case 16. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6 + 51\,x^4 + 2\,x^3 + 1092\,x^2 - 120\,x + 9197)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 1487 \cdot 3559 \cdot 1812033031 \cdot 907233414707\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^7 \cdot 5^3 \cdot 15187 \cdot 389057 \cdot 28836797034121 \cdot 189518952204093534700155915242838402121410067 \cdot 943186314533675474591371885527987622681002216 1\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^5 \cdot 3^{35} \cdot 19^7 \cdot 37^{14} \cdot 79^{14} \cdot 13373064392147^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_{16} : 66648606\,x^4 - 10422787\,x^3y - 1171743077\,x^3z + 272093232\,x^2y^2 + 894539212\,x^2y\,z + 1758438152\,x^2z^2 - 239684773\,x\,y^3 - 3355325973\,x\,y^2z + 21854285561\,x\,y\,z^2 + 213880974126\,x\,z^3 + 731104019\,y^4 - 6282157788\,y^3z - 38790710054\,y^2z^2 + 288506848419\,y\,z^3 + 1153356733618\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{16} = 2^{-45} \cdot 3^{-27} \cdot 19^{18} \cdot I_{27}$.

Case 17. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6 - 18\,x^5 + 78\,x^4 - 160\,x^3 + 5205\,x^2 + 5154\,x + 72188)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 7 \cdot 6801959 \cdot 228715129 \cdot 376029107\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^{14} \cdot 5^3 \cdot 109229116745684805483948641281707551822815339775164567721870351605715151964604922256457426514975768 1\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29} \cdot 3^{77} \cdot 19^7 \cdot 1229^{14} \cdot 3913841117^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_{17} : 3717829\,x^4 - 1434896\,x^3y + 19525079\,x^3z - 23623031\,x^2y^2 + 55253545\,x^2y\,z + 168545160\,x^2z^2 + 36024736\,x\,y^3 - 64558785\,x\,y^2z + 379342822\,x\,y\,z^2 - 329255097\,x\,z^3 + 42096963\,y^4 + 115245505\,y^3z - 817353798\,y^2z^2 + 498157725\,y\,z^3 - 34967215\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{17} = 2^{-45} \cdot 3^{-27} \cdot I_{27}$.

Case 18. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6 - 14\,x^5 - 26\,x^4 + 824\,x^3 + 4277\,x^2 - 40634\,x + 259076)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 71 \cdot 14587481 \cdot 52419571 \cdot 3247781950628503\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^{12} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 13^3 \cdot 113 \cdot 97867439018065101142347568 9 \cdot 541849128633869544959360001663880506326202 1 \cdot 27729648492453801276662718188392094052809067752810335 13\,,$$
$$I_{27} = -2^{41} \cdot 3^9 \cdot 19^7 \cdot 101^{14} \cdot 251^{14} \cdot 74688437251869014^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$X_{18} : 3278898472\,x^4 + 35774613556\,x^3y - 172165788624\,x^3z - 42633841878\,x^2y^2 + 224611458828\,x^2y\,z + 362086824567\,x^2z^2 + 6739276447\,x\,y^3 + 195387780024\,x\,y^2z + 1153791743988\,x\,y\,z^2 - 3461357269578\,x\,z^3 - 18110161476\,y^4 - 549025255626\,y^3z - 482663555556\,y^2z^2 + 15534718882176\,y\,z^3 - 61875497274721\,z^4 = 0$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{18} = 2^{-45} \cdot 3^{-9} \cdot 13^{18} \cdot I_{27}$.

Case 19. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-2\,x^5+102\,x^4-160\,x^3+5845\,x^2-206\,x+140932)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^5\cdot 3\cdot 4079\,,$$
$$I_{12} = 2^{12}\cdot 5\cdot 71\cdot 5882407\cdot 63326507\,,$$
$$I_{27} = 2^{29}\cdot 3^{27}\cdot 11^{14}\cdot 43^7\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_{19}: {} & -7\,x^4-2\,x^3y+16\,x^3z+7\,x^2y^2-6\,x^2yz-8\,x^2z^2+10\,xy^3+14\,xy^2z \\ & +2\,xyz^2-15\,xz^3+y^4+10\,y^3z+13\,y^2z^2+17\,yz^3+14\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{19} = 2^{-45}\cdot 3^{-27}\cdot I_{27}$.

Case 20. Invariants given by the field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^6-4\,x^5+163\,x^4-398\,x^3+14336\,x^2-24316\,x+544769)$ are

$$I_3 = 2^5\cdot 3\cdot 88793\cdot 24601537\cdot 2356731958879\,,$$
$$\begin{aligned} I_{12} = {} & -2^7\cdot 3^4\cdot 5^3\cdot 495410863\cdot 363294236796144821 \\ & \cdot 21291260469612714262160817596603769775664533173092752310026520546052941 09\,, \end{aligned}$$
$$I_{27} = 2^5\cdot 3^9\cdot 67^7\cdot 1439^{14}\cdot 27390211260001^{14}\,.$$

They define the CM plane quartic

$$\begin{aligned} X_{20}: {} & 42978499\,x^4+91609890\,x^3y+226411413\,x^3z-152950386\,x^2y^2+225973290\,x^2yz \\ & +64073952\,x^2z^2+26287800\,xy^3+11918208\,xy^2z-742181730\,xyz^2-464894250\,xz^3 \\ & -29463649\,y^4+198058830\,y^3z-144994689\,y^2z^2-208213515\,yz^3+85424183\,z^4=0 \end{aligned}$$

of discriminant $\operatorname{disc} X_{20} = -2^{-45}\cdot 3^{-9}\cdot I_{27}$.

References

[1] L. Afflerbach and H. Grothe. Calculation of Minkowski-reduced lattice bases. *Computing*, 35(3-4):269–276, 1985.

[2] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, P. Griffiths, and J. Harris. *Geometry of algebraic curves, Vol. I*, volume 267 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1985.

[3] J. S. Balakrishnan, S. Ionica, K. Lauter, and C. Vincent. Genus 3. Package available at https://github.com/christellevincent/genus3.

[4] J. S. Balakrishnan, S. Ionica, K. Lauter, and C. Vincent. Constructing genus 3 hyperelliptic Jacobians with CM. arXiv:1603.03832, 2016.

[5] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust. The Magma algebra system. I. The user language. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 24(3-4):235–265, 1997. Computational algebra and number theory (London, 1993).

[6] I. Bouw, J. Cooley, K. E. Lauter, E. Lorenzo García, M. Manes, R. Newton, and E. Ozman. Bad reduction of genus 3 curves with complex multiplication. Women in Numbers Europe, Research Directions in Number Theory, Association for Women in Mathematics Series Volume 2, Springer, 2015.

[7] F. Bouyer and M. Streng. Examples of CM curves of genus two defined over the reflex field. *LMS J. Comput. Math.*, 18(1):507–538, 2015.

[8] R. Bröker and P. Stevenhagen. Elliptic curves with a given number of points. In *Algorithmic number theory*, volume 3076 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 117–131. Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[9] H. Cohen. *A course in computational algebraic number theory*, volume 138 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[10] E. Costa, N. Mascot, J. Sijsling, and J. Voight. Rigorous computation of the endomorphism ring of a Jacobian. In preparation, 2016.

[11] B. Deconinck and M. van Hoeij. Computing Riemann matrices of algebraic curves. *Phys. D*, 152/153:28–46, 2001. Advances in nonlinear mathematics and science.

[12] J. Dixmier. On the projective invariants of quartic plane curves. *Adv. in Math.*, 64:279–304, 1987.
[13] R. Dupont. *Moyenne arithmético-géométrique, suites de Borchardt et applications*. PhD thesis, École polytechnique, Palaiseau, 2006.
[14] N. D. Elkies. The Klein quartic in number theory. In *The eightfold way*, volume 35 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 51–101. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[15] A.-S. Elsenhans. Good models for cubic surfaces. Preprint at https://math.uni-paderborn.de/fileadmin/mathematik/AG-Computeralgebra/Preprints-elsenhans/red_5.pdf.
[16] A.-S. Elsenhans. Explicit computations of invariants of plane quartic curves. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 68(part 2):109–115, 2015.
[17] A. Fiorentino. Weber's formula for the bitangents of a smooth plane quartic. arXiv:1612.02049, 2016.
[18] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
[19] M. Girard and D. R. Kohel. Classification of genus 3 curves in special strata of the moduli space. In Hess, F. (ed.) et al., Algorithmic number theory. 7th international symposium, ANTS-VII, Berlin, Germany, July 23–28, 2006. Proceedings. Berlin: Springer. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4076, 346-360 (2006)., 2006.
[20] E. Z. Goren and K. E. Lauter. Class invariants for quartic CM fields. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 57(2):457–480, 2007.
[21] E. Gottschling. Explizite Bestimmung der Randflächen des Fundamentalbereiches der Modulgruppe zweiten Grades. *Math. Ann.*, 138:103–124, 1959.
[22] B. H. Gross and J. Harris. On some geometric constructions related to theta characteristics. In *Contributions to automorphic forms, geometry, and number theory*, pages 279–311. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 2004.
[23] J. Guàrdia. On the Torelli problem and Jacobian Nullwerte in genus three, 2009.
[24] B. Helfrich. Algorithms to construct Minkowski reduced and Hermite reduced lattice bases. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 41(2-3):125–139 (1986), 1985.
[25] J.-I. Igusa. *Theta functions*, volume 194 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.
[26] P. Kılıçer. *The CM class number one problem for curves*. PhD thesis, Universiteit Leiden and Université de Bordeaux, 2016.
[27] P. Kılıçer, K. Lauter, E. Lorenzo García, R. Newton, E. Ozman, and M. Streng. A bound on the primes of bad reduction for CM curves of genus 3. arXiv:1609.05826, 2016.
[28] P. Kılıçer, E. Lorenzo García, and M. Streng. On primes dividing the invariants of Picard curves. In preparation, 2016.
[29] P. Kılıçer and M. Streng. Rational CM points and class polynomials for genus three. In preparation, 2016.
[30] H. Klingen. *Introductory lectures on Siegel modular forms*, volume 20 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
[31] K. Koike and A. Weng. Construction of CM Picard curves. *Math. Comp.*, 74(249):499–518 (electronic), 2005.
[32] S. Koizumi. The fields of moduli for polarized abelian varieties and for curves. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 48:37–55, 1972.
[33] H. Labrande. Calculating theta functions in genus 3. Package available at http://hlabrande.fr/pubs/fastthetaconstantsgenus3.m.
[34] H. Labrande. *Explicit computation of the Abel-Jacobi map and its inverse*. PhD thesis, Université de Lorraine and University of Calgary, Nov. 2016.
[35] S. Lang. *Complex multiplication*, volume 255 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
[36] J.-C. Lario and A. Somoza. A note on Picard curves of CM-type. arXiv:1611.02582, 2016.
[37] K. Lauter. Geometric methods for improving the upper bounds on the number of rational points on algebraic curves over finite fields. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 10(1):19–36, 2001. With an appendix by J.-P. Serre.
[38] K. Lauter and B. Viray. An arithmetic intersection formula for denominators of Igusa class polynomials. *Amer. J. Math.*, 137(2):497–533, 2015.

[39] A. K. Lenstra, H. W. Lenstra, Jr., and L. Lovász. Factoring polynomials with rational coefficients. *Math. Ann.*, 261(4):515–534, 1982.
[40] R. Lercier and C. Ritzenthaler. Invariants and reconstructions for genus 2 curves in any characteristic, 2008. Available in Magma 2.15 and later.
[41] R. Lercier and C. Ritzenthaler. Hyperelliptic curves and their invariants: geometric, arithmetic and algorithmic aspects. *J. Algebra*, 372:595–636, 2012.
[42] R. Lercier, C. Ritzenthaler, F. Rovetta, and J. Sijsling. Parametrizing the moduli space of curves and applications to smooth plane quartics over finite fields. *LMS J. Comput. Math.*, 17(suppl. A):128–147, 2014.
[43] R. Lercier, C. Ritzenthaler, and J. Sijsling. Fast computation of isomorphisms of hyperelliptic curves and explicit descent. In E. W. Howe and K. S. Kedlaya, editors, *Proceedings of the Tenth Algorithmic Number Theory Symposium*, pages 463–486. Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 2012.
[44] R. Lercier, C. Ritzenthaler, and J. Sijsling. Explicit Galois obstruction and descent for hyperelliptic curves with tamely cyclic reduced automorphism group. *Math. Comp.*, 85(300):2011–2045, 2016.
[45] R. Lercier, C. Ritzenthaler, and J. Sijsling. quartic_reconstruction; a Magma package for reconstructing plane quartics from Dixmier-Ohno invariants. Package available at https://github.com/JRSijsling/quartic_reconstruction, 2016.
[46] R. Lercier, C. Ritzenthaler, and J. Sijsling. Reconstructing plane quartics from their invariants. arXiv:1606.05594, 2016.
[47] J.-F. Mestre. Construction de courbes de genre 2 à partir de leurs modules. In *Effective methods in algebraic geometry*, volume 94 of *Prog. Math.*, pages 313–334, Boston, 1991. Birkäuser.
[48] S. Qiao, W. Zhang, and Y. Wei. Practical algorithms for constucting HKZ and Minkowski reduced bases. *Technical Report, McMaster University*, 2011.
[49] H. E. Rauch and H. M. Farkas. *Theta functions with applications to Riemann surfaces*. The Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md., 1974.
[50] C. Ritzenthaler. Point counting on genus 3 non hyperelliptic curves. In *Algorithmic number theory*, volume 3076 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 379–394. Springer, Berlin, 2004.
[51] J.-P. Serre and J. Tate. Good reduction of abelian varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:492–517, 1968.
[52] G. Shimura. On the field of rationality for an abelian variety. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 45:167–178, 1971.
[53] G. Shimura. On abelian varieties with complex multiplication. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 34(1):65–86, 1977.
[54] G. Shimura and Y. Taniyama. Complex multiplication of Abelian varieties and its applications to number theory. *Publ. Math. Soc. Japan*, 6, 1961.
[55] D. Simon. Solving quadratic equations using reduced unimodular quadratic forms. Preprint available at http://www.math.unicaen.fr/∼simon/maths/qfsolve.html, 2013.
[56] A.-M. Spallek. *Kurven vom Geschlecht 2 und ihre Anwendung in Publik-Key-Kryptosystemen*. PhD thesis, Institut für Experimentelle Mathematik, Essen, 1994.
[57] M. Stoll. Reduction theory of point clusters in projective space. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 5(2):553–565, 2011.
[58] M. Streng. Sage package for using Shimura's reciprocity law for Siegel modular funcions. http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/∼streng/recip.
[59] M. Streng. Computing Igusa class polynomials. *Math. Comp.*, 83(285):275–309, 2014. arXiv:0903.4766.
[60] J. Tate. Classes d'isogénie des variétés abéliennes sur un corps fini (d'après Honda). In *Séminaire Bourbaki 1968/69*, volume 179 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 95–110. Springer, Berlin, 1971.
[61] W. Tautz, J. Top, and A. Verberkmoes. Explicit hyperelliptic curves with real multiplication and permutation polynomials. *Canad. J. Math.*, 43(5):1055–1064, 1991.
[62] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 7.4)*, 2016. http://www.sagemath.org.
[63] S. M. van Rijnswou. *Testing the equivalence of planar curves*. PhD thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Eindhoven, 2001.

[64] P. van Wamelen. Examples of genus two CM curves defined over the rationals. *Math. Comp.*, 68(225):307–320, 1999.
[65] J. Voight. Identifying the matrix ring: algorithms for quaternion algebras and quadratic forms. In *Quadratic and higher degree forms*, volume 31 of *Dev. Math.*, pages 255–298. Springer, New York, 2013.
[66] H. Weber. Theory of abelian functions of genus 3. (Theorie der Abel'schen Functionen vom Geschlecht 3.), 1876.
[67] A. Weng. A class of hyperelliptic CM-curves of genus three. *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.*, 16(4):339–372, 2001.

Pinar Kilicer, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Institut für Mathematik, 26111 Oldenburg, Germany
E-mail address: pinarkilicer@gmail.com

Hugo Labrande, Loria/INRIA Lorraine, Équipe CARAMEL, 615 Rue du jardin botanique, 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex, France.

ISPIA, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr NW, Calgary, Alberta, T2N 1N4, Canada.
E-mail address: hugo@hlabrande.fr

Reynald Lercier, DGA MI, La Roche Marguerite, 35174 Bruz, France.

IRMAR, Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France.
E-mail address: reynald.lercier@m4x.org

Christophe Ritzenthaler, IRMAR, Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France.
E-mail address: christophe.ritzenthaler@univ-rennes1.fr

Jeroen Sijsling, Institut für Reine Mathematik, Universität Ulm, Helmholtzstrasse 18, 89081 Ulm, Germany
E-mail address: sijsling@gmail.com

Marco Streng, Mathematisch Instituut, Universiteit Leiden, P.O. box 9512, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
E-mail address: marco.streng@gmail.com